THE NON-ENTITY OF PROTESTANCY.

OR

A Discourse, wherein is demonstrated, that *Protestancy* is not any Reall thing, but in it selfe a *Platonicall Idæa*; a wast of all Positiue Fayth; and a meere NOTHING.

Written by a Catholike Priest of the Society of IESVS.

Dormierunt somnium suum, & NIHIL invenerunt. Psalm. 73.

Væ Prophetis insipientibus, qui sequuntur Spiritum suum, & NIHIL vident. Ezech 13.

Permissu Superiorum 1633.

THE
NON-ENTITY
OF
PROTESTANCY.
OR
A Dilcourſe, wherein is demonſtrated, that Proteſtancy is not any real thing, but in it ſelfe a Platonicall Idea; a wafe of all Poſſible Faith; and a meere
NOTHING.
Printed by a Catholike Priest of the
Society of IESVS.

TO THE IVDICIOVS AND LEARNED PROTESTANT

LEARNED MEN,

This Treatise vvas for you chiefly first vndertaken. The Ground-vvorke, vvhereupon the *Systema*, or Frame thereof is built, is a mixture of *Philosophy*, and *Schoole-diuinity*: Points, vvith

reference to the more ignorant Protestant, being (as the Schoole-Dialect is) *extra sphæram Activitatis*; that is, beyond the limited apprehension of their shallow & narrow conceits. It is but small (you see) in Quantity; but I hope, it will hould out in weight. The subiect of it, is vniuersall, and (to my knowledge) heertofore *professo* not much walked in, or practised. It is also (no doubt) nauseous, and displeasing to you; seeing it attempteth to proove, that your Religion is in it selfe a meere *Non-Entity*; *Its Being* consisting in a *Not-being*, and *Essence*, in

vvant

vvant of *Essence*. That Religio of yours, I meane, vvhich at this day hath inuaded seuerall parts in Europe; vvhose high flight is mantained only vvith the vvings of certayne Princes, & Commonvvealths povver and greatnes; vvhich violently carries (vvhere it reignes) all things before it, vvith the impetuous streame of its ovvne torrent: briefly to vvhich for our not yielding obedience in our ovvne Country, so great & heauy mulcts and pressures are impoſed vpo Recusants: though euen in al Iustice, the paying of *Nothing* is a sufficient penalty, for the not professing, of vvhat is

Nothing. I confesse it is painfull to discourse vvell of *Nothing*; as it is difficult to run a *diuision of knowledge*, vpon the *ground of ignorance*. Neuertheles, since your owne learning vvill force you to giue assent to those *Theorems* of Diuinity and Philosophy, vpo the Arch vvherof, the vveight of the vvhole Treatise resteth; I am not vvholy in despayre, but that at the closure of all, your morning & more retired thoughts (as being voyded of preiudice) may perhaps entertaine it vvith a more indifferent, and impartiall Censure. If you heere demand, hovv can this great Attempt

of mine be performed, (for great in your Iudgements, it must yet needs be thought) in shewing, that *Protestancy* is in its owne Nature, a *Non-Entity*, & that, its *All, is Nothing*, as not hauing any reality of *Being* to support it: to this I answere, (omitting other reasons heerafter insisted vpon) that since *Protestancy* consisteth only in the *denyalls* and *Priuations* of *Affirmatiue* points of our Christian, and Romane Fayth; (which *denyalls* and *Priuations* in their owne nature are *Irreall*, as heerafter will be euicted) that therefore it is wholy diuested of all true

Subsistence, or Being. For vvho obserueth not, that *Protestancy* is a Religion, resting more in *denyalls* of Truths, then in defence of *Positiue*, and formall Errours? The veyle vnder vvhich *Protestãcy* masked it selfe vvhen it first entred vpon the stage, vvas the outvvard apparence of a gratefull *Reformation*; vvhich vvord of *Reformation*, is by them vsed, as in opposition to a precedent *Corruption*; from vvhich the *Protestants* professe to rescue and deliuer the Church of God. Which *Corruption* (they say) vvas first brought in by the Bishop of Rome, (a) *Vvho ouer-vvhelmed*

(a) *Symon de Voyon in his discourse vpon the Catalogue of Doctours. Epist. to the Reader.*

the

the whole world in the dregs of Antichristian filthynes, abominable Superstitions, & Traditions &c. Thus did the first *Protestants* thinke good, to cloath their naked Religion in the fayre attire of a presumed *Reformation*; which *Reformation* consisteth onely in an vtter subuerting, and destroying of most of our *Affirmatiue* Catholike Articles of fayth; and in lieu of them in introducing the *Negatiues*: so as by this proceeding the *Protestants* may be said (to speake alluſiuely) to trench ouer, neere vpon *Gods Omnipotency*, in attempting to exercise the two Acts of *Creation* & *Anni-*

hilation, peculiar to his diuine Maiesty: for their owne *Protestant* faith (as grounded only vpon *Negatiues*, and *Priuations*) they haue drawne out of an *Abysse*, and *Informity of Nothing*: and our Positiue and *Affirmatiue Catholike* fayth they labour (what they can) by such their molitions, to reduce to *Nothing*. And although the *Protestants* doe endeauour to enamell & guilde ouer their *Negatiue fayth*, with many detorted & misapplyed Texts of Sacred Writ, by the help of the *Priuate reuealing Spirit* (their *Oedipus*,) that so it may appeare glorious in an erring eye: ne-

uer-

neuertheles certaine it is, that after such testimonies are truly ballanced and vveighed by the Authority of the vvhole Church of God; all such fading splendour of *Professancy* doth but resemble the light of a *Glovv-vvorme*, vvhich, the neerer one comes to it, the lesser it appeares, til in the end it vvholy vanisheth avvay. But seeing, a short Preface best sorteth to a short discourse, I vvill heer stay my Penn; remitting the learned Reader to the diligent & impartiall perusall of these ensuing Leaues; & assuring him, that it impugneth the light of Reason (since *God* and *Nothing*

thing are incompatible,) that he, whome the Philosophers for his greater Perfection of Essence, style, *Ens Entium*, should be truly honoured with a Religion, which is a *Non-Ens*.

Your in Christ Jesus

W. B.

THE CONTENTS OF the seuerall Chapters

Certaine Prolegomena, *of which the first is,*

CHap. 1. *That in all positiue & Affirmatiue points of Faith, the Protestants do agree with the Catholikes; The Protestants borrowing the sayd Affirmatiue points frō the Church of Rome.*

Chap. 2. *The second Prolegomenon. In such points of fayth, wherin* Protestancy *differeth from the Romane Church; all the sayd points are meerely* Negations, *to the contrary* Affirmatiue *Articles, beleiued by the Church of Rome.*

Chap. 3. *That the Protestants haue altered, corrected and reformed their* Translations *of the Bible, and the Liturgy, or common Booke of Prayer, in fauour of their Negatiue Religion; euery later excepting against the former, as corrupt, and impure.*

Chap. 4. *That* Protestancy *is a* Non-Entity.

thing are incompatible,) that he, whome the Philosophers for his greater Perfection of Essence, style, *Ens Entium*, should be truly honoured with a Religion, which is a *Non-Ens*.

Your in Christ Jesus

W. B.

THE CONTENTS OF the seuerall Chapters

Certaine Prolegomena, of which the first is,

CHap. 1. *That in all positiue & Affirmatiue points of Faith, the Protestants do agree with the Catholikes; The Protestants harrowing the sayd Affirmatiue points frõ the Church of Rome.*

Chap. 2. *The second Prolegomenon, Viz. In such points of fayth, wherin* Protestancy *differeth from the Romane Church; all the sayd points are meerely* Negations, *to the contrary Affirmatiue Articles, beleiued by the Church of Rome.*

Chap. 3. *That the Protestants haue often corrected and reformed their* Translations *of the Bible, and the Liturgy, or common Booke of Prayer, in fauour of their* Negatiue Religion; *euery later excepting against the former, as corrupt, and impure.*

Chap. 4. *That* Protestancy *is a* Non-Entity.

Entity; proued fro the Principles of Schoole Diuinity & Philosophy.

Chap. 5. The Non-Entity of Protestancy by reason of its Negations, proued from the like supposed Example of a Philosopher, denying most Principles of Philosophy.

Chap. 6. That the Heathen Philosopher conspireth with the Protestant in the deny-all of most (if not all) of such points of Religion, wherein the Protestant by his lyke deny all of them, differeth from the Catholike.

Chap. 7. That Protestancy is but a Nullity of Fayth; and consequently with reference to fayth, a Non-Entity; proued from the definition of Fayth, and other conditions necessarily annexed thereto.

Chap. 8. That Protestancy cannot be defined: And that therefore it is a Non-Entity.

Chap. 9. That Protestancy consisteth of Doctrines meerly Contradictory in themselues: and that therefore Protestancy is a Non-Entity.

Chap. 10. That Heresy, as being a Priuation, is Non-Ens; and consequently that Protestancy (as consisting of the old condemned Heresies) is a Non-Entity.

Chap. 11. That there are diuers Positions

of

of Protestancy, *which (besides that they are implicitely but* Negations *to the Catholikes contrary* Affirmatiue *Doctrines) are in their owne Nature, meerly voyd of all reality of* Being.

Chap. 12. *That the* Protestant *Church is a meer* Non-Entity, *or* Idæa, *proued from the confessed* Inuisibility *thereof.*

Chap. 13. *That the confessed want of* Personall Succession *and* lawfull Calling *in the* Protestant Church, *proueth that Church to be no* Reall thing: *and consequently that* Protestancy *is but an* Intentionality, *or bare Notion of the mynd.*

Chap. 14. *The* Non-Entity of Protestancy, *proued from that it worketh in the wills of the Professours.*

Chap. 15. *The* Non-Entity *of* Protestancy, *proued from that, it is not agreed vpon what doctrines be Protestancy, or what Professours be members of the Protestant Church.*

Chap. 16. *The* Non-Entity *of Protestancy demonstrated, from that euery Protestant eyther in himselfe, or in his Predecessours, originally departed, and came out from the Roman Catholike Church.*

Chap. 17. *That the* Protestant *denyes the Authorities of all those* Affirmatiue *and*

Posi-

positiue Heads from whence the Catholikes draw their Proofes.

Chap. 18. That sundry learned Protestants (as not houlding a Negatiue fayth to be any Reall Fayth at all) agree with the Catholikes in beleeuing the Affirmatiue Articles of the Catholike Fayth.

Chap. 19. Certaine Porismata, rising out of the seuerall passages of this Treatise.

Chap. 20. That the Catholike Church and the Protestant Church, are not one, and the same Church: though some Protestants teach the contrary, for the supporting of their owne Church.

The Conclusion.

CERTAINE

CERTAINE PROLEGOMENA:

Of which the first is, That in all positiue and affirmatiue points of faith, the Protestants doe agree with the Catholikes: the Protestants borrowing the said affirmatiue points from the Church of Rome.

CHAP. I.

LEarned Reader. For the better facilitating of this my assumed taske and labour, & for the more easy playning the way to the ensuing discourse, I am first heere to prefixe certayne *Prolegomena* (as I may call them) or *Prefaces*: The first whereof is to shew, that the Protestants in all *affirmatiue* articles of fayth, houlden by them at

this day, doe agree with the Romane Catholike Church. The ſecond; that in ſuch points of fayth, wherein the Proteſtants do diſſent from the Romane Church; all the ſaid points ſo defended by the Proteſtants, are meerely *Negations* of the contrary *affirmatiue* Articles, believed by the Catholikes. In this Chapter I will intreate of the firſt part; ſepoſing the chapter following for the ſecond. And according to this my aſſertion, we find, that the Proteſtants do believe affirmatiuely with vs; that there is *One God, and three Perſons*; that, *the ſecond Perſon was incarnated, and ſuffered death vpon the Croſſe for the expiation of the ſins of the world*; that there are *two Sacraments*, to wit, *Baptiſme*, and the *Euchariſt*; that there are *certaine Canonicall diuine writinges*, *commonly called the Holy*

Scrip-

Scriptures: & finally they believe with vs Catholikes, the *Apostles Creed*. All which points (so needy and begging is Noueliſme in faith for its own ſupporting) the Proteſtants do freely acknowledge, that they borrow & receaue from our Catholike and Romane Church. For thus doth *D. VVhitaker* confeſſe of this point: (a) *The Papists haue the Scripture and Baptiſme &c. and theſe came to vs from them.* With whome agreeth herein *D. Doue*, ſaying: (b) *VVe should the Creed of the Apoſtles, of Athanaſius, of Nice, of Epheſus, of Conſtantinople, and the ſame Bible, which we receaued from them.* But Luther with full conſent herto more amply diſcourſeth of this point, thus acknowledging: (c) *VVe confeſſe, that there is vnder the Papacy moſt of the Chriſtian good, yea rather all the Chriſtian good, and*

(a) D. VVhitak. de Eccleſ. pag. 369.

(b) Doue in his perſuaſiõ to English Recuſants pag. 23.

(c) Luth. l. contra Anabaptiſt.

that from thence it came to vs. Verily we confesse, there is in the Papacy true Scripture, true Baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keyes to the remission of sinnes, the true office of preaching, true Catechisme &c. I say further, there is in the Papacy true Christianity, or rather the true kernell of Christianity. Thus Luther. Now from these liberall (yet most true) confessions of our aduersaries, this inuitable resultancy riseth, to wit; that the Protestants, though they belieue these former *affirmatiue Articles*, (and perhaps some few others) with the Catholikes, yet for such their beliefe of thē, they are not, nor can be truly reputed Protestants, but only Christians in generall, or rather Catholikes (& this but κατ' ἐξοχήν, or at most but *Analogically*) since they borrow their beliefe of the

said

sayd *affirmatiue* Articles from our Catholicke Church (as is aboue confessed) and therfore *Protestancy* doth not rest in the beliefe of the sayd *affirmatiue* dogmaticall points. From hence then we may conclude, that the *reduplicatiue formality*, or *ratio formalis*, as I may say with the Schoolemen, of *Protestancy*, only consisteth in the *denyall* and reprouall of the particular *affirmatiue* Articles, in which it differeth at this day from the Church of Rome, as hereafter wilbe proued; and that a Protestãt (*quatenus* a *Protestant*) is not, as he believeth these former *affirmatiue* Articles; but as he believeth not other *affirmatiue* points, believed heertofore, & now by the Church of Rome. And according heerto, Philosophy teacheth, that this particle *quatenus*, or the *reduplicatiue*

formality, euer falleth vpon the *differentia*, and not vpon the *genus*.

I will exemplify this point in other innouations of doctrine. *Iouinian* taught (as S. (d) *Hierome* & (e) S. *Auguſtine* do witneſſe,) That *virginity was not to be preferred before wedlocke*; that, *faſting was not meritorious*; that, *a man once hauing true fayth could not ſinne* (all good Proteſtancy at this day. *Iouinian* in all other *affirmatiue* points agreed with the then Church of Rome, but diſſented from it onely in theſe *Negatiues*. Now *Iouinianiſme* truly reſteth only in the defence of theſe its *Negatiue* Poſitions, and not as it agreeth with the then Church of Rome, in other *affirmatiue* points. And his followers were called *Iouiniani*, only by reaſon of their defence of the ſaid *Negations*, and not otherwiſe. Againe

(d) Hierome lib. 1. & 2. contra Iouin.
(e) de hæreſib. cap. 82.

Manicheus did only deny *freewill* in man (as (f) *S. Augustine* recordeth) and cõparted with the then known Church of Christ in all other *affirmative* points; and accordingly his Sect was called *Manichisme*, not in that it agreed with the then Catholike Church in other *affirmative* positions taught by the sayd Church; but only by reason the authour thereof *denyed* the aforesayd *Affirmative* Article of *freewill*. In like sort *Brownisme* resteth only in the *denyall* of such points, wherein the Brownists dissent frõ the Protestants, and not in their conformity with the Protestants, or Catholickes in any *affirmative* points. Now to apply this to our present purpose; the *obiectum adæquatum* (to speake in the Philosophers *idiome*) of *Protestancy*, is only the *denial* of such *affirmative* Catho-

(f) *Lib. de hæres. cap.* 46.

like points, wherin *Protestācy* differeth at this day frō the Church of Rome; & not in its beliefe of those few *affirmatiue* Articles, wherein the Protestants as yet agree with the sayd Church. According heerto, it did fall out, that in the first infancy of the late appearing faith of Protestants, the first stampers thereof at their publike meeting volūtarily, for their better distinguishing of themselues from the Catholikes, imposed to themselues the name of *Protestants*, and to their fayth the title of *Protestancy*: implying, by that *word*, that they protested themselues absolutely to deny such & such *affirmatiue* points of fayth, which the Church of Rome at that tyme (& euer afore) maintaines aud affirmes. For if we respect those few doctrines, wherin they did agree with the Church

of Rome; the Protestants had no reason to vse any such terme of distinguishment, seeing both sides did belieue the same Articles. Therefore of necessity the word *Protestancy* (as seruing for a character, or signature of its separation from our Catholike fayth) is to be restrayned to such points, wherin the Protestants by their *denyall* of them, then dissented from the Church of Rome. But by this we may see, how loath is Nouellisme in doctrine to impath it selfe in the beaten tract of Reuerend Antiquity, or to runne in the accustomed known channel, wherin the stream of Christian Religiõ in former tymes had its course. And thus far of this point; the conclusion being, that *Protestancy* (as *Protestancy*) *only consisteth in denyall of such affirmatiue points, which the Church of*

Rome affirmes to be true; & not in beleiuing with the ſayd Church certayne chiefe points of Chriſtianity aboue expreſſed.

THE II. PROLEGOMENON.

In ſuch points of fayth, wherein Proteſtancy diſſenteth from the Romane Church, al the ſaid points are meerly Negations to the contrary affirmatiue Artïcles, beleeued by the Church of Rome.

CHAP. II.

MY ſecond *Prolegomenon* is, to demonſtrate, by gradation, how the Proteſtãts, as aboue is intimated, haue reformed (or if you will, refined) their Religion in ſeuerall points of Fayth; and this only by pure *Negatiues* to the Catholikes contrary *Affirmatiue* Aſſertions of them.

Thus did the Protestants reforme our supposed errors, with their owne true and reall errors; so the (a) Pharisy reproued the Publicans sinne, with farre greater sinne. But to dissect the particulers, *Luther* (the *Prodromus* of these calamitous tymes) was first an acknowledged Catholike Priest, as himselfe (b) writeth. This man first begun his *Reformation* with a mincing hesitation & trepidatiõ of iudgment, & busied himself only with the *denial* of *Pardons*; but by litle & litle taking greater courage, he next proceedeth to the *denyall* of (c) *Papall Iurisdiction*, *and* (d) *Monasticall state & profession*. And being once fleshed in his profession, he (daily more & more sharpining his censuring rasour) cut of at one blow, (e) *foure Sacraments*. He finally concluded with the *denyall* of the (f) *Masse* &

(a) Luc. 18.
(b) So witnesseth Sleydan in li. 16. fol. 232.
(c) Luther in captiuit. Babilon. tom. 2. fol. 63.
(d) Luth. de votis Monasticis in tom. 2. Wittemberg.
(e) Luth. tom. 2. fol. 63.
(f) Luth. de abrogãda missa priuata, in tom. 2. fol. 244.

bowor Priest-

Priesthood, of seueral parts of (g) Canonicall Scripture, (h) of *freewill*, & of *Iustification of workes*. Thus far proceeded Luther. And that the *denyall* of these former points did not happen at one time but by degrees, appeareth in that the further he proceeded in this his *denyal* of Catholicke Articles, the more he reputed himselfe reformed; and in his later writinges he intreateth pardon of his reader for his presumed defect in his former writings, he thus excusing himselfe. *The (i) Reader may find how many, and how great things, I humbly granted to the Pope in my former writings, which in my later, & these times I hold for greatest blasphemy and abomination: therefore, pious Reader, thou must pardon me this errour.* O see, how pride of iudgement (the *Hypostasis* of heresy) masketh it selfe vnder the borrowed

(g) *Luth. præfat. in epist. Iacob. & vide* Bulling vpon the Apocalips englished, cap. 1.

(h) *Luth. de seruo arbitrio in tom. 2. fol. 434.*

(i) *tom. 1. Wittēb. in præfat. & tom. 2. fol. 63.*

owed veile of religious zeale.

From *Luthers* loines immediatly descended *Zuinglius*, *Bullinger*, *Bucer*, and some others. But these ungrateful and disobedient Impes did not rest satisfied with their Fathers *reformation*, but retayning it for good, as far as it went, proceeded much further in their *Negatiõs* of the Articles of the Roman Religion: since they *denyed the Reall & Presence*, *denyed* (l) *Purgatory*, *and praying for the dead*, *denyed* (m) *praying to Saints*, *denyed* (n) *the vse of Images*, *& finally denyed* (o) *crossing of ones selfe*. Thus farre these men made their progresse in their *Negatiue* Religion; who conspired with their Father (through their desire euer of further *reformation*) by excepting in their later writings against their former, as not being (p) *Negatiue* inough: and yet we

(k) *Zuinglius tom. 2. fol. 375. & 416.*

(l) *Zuing. tom. 2. fol. 378.*

(m) *Vide Luth. in ep. ad Georgiũ Spalatinum.*

(n) See Whitgifts defence in the examination of places. fol. penul.

(o) Lib. intituled agaynst *Symbols.* part. 1. c. 2. Sect. 30

(p) See *Zuingl.* to. 2. fol. 202. & vide *Bucer. Script. Anglicana* pag. 680.

we are taught by the abortiue A
poſtle, (1. Cor 5.) that, *modicum fermentum totam maſſã corrupit*. Bu
to proceed higher; for as yet th
Scene of a *Negatiue Reformatio* lea
ueth not the Stage. Frõ theſe for
men men, did ſpring *Caluin, Beza*
the Puritans of England, Scotland, &
Geneua; which men, as being pre
ſumed to be wholy ſpiritualized
and as it were obſeſt with the *ho*
ly Ghoſt (ſuch is the pride of No
uelisme) made a farre more refyne
and ſublimated *Reformation* (an
all by *Negatiues*) then their Pre
deceſſours had done. For almoſt
all the other *Affirmatiue* Catholi
ke Articles paſſed vnder the fyle
of their diſlike. And therewith
they wholy *denied* the ſaid articles
The chiefe articles *denied* by theſe
Enthyſiaſts (to omit diuers of them
for breuity) are theſe following, (q

(q) D. Willet, in his ſpeciall booke entituled: *Lymbomaſtix*, & moſt Puritanes.

Chriſt

Christs descending into hell: the Headship of the Church to reside in one alone: (r) vniuersality of grace, (s) the power of priest-hood to remit sinnes, (t) Baptisme by lay persons in tyme of necessity, (u) Ceremonies, and (x) Church apparell &c. But the *deny all* of Beza shall serue as a *Chorus*, to the former particuler *denyalls*; who taking (as it should seeme) a wanton complacency, in repeating the word, I *deny*, thus writeth. * *I deny that God can make Christs body to be present in the Eucharist, I deny seauen Sacnaments, I deny grace to be giuen by Sacraments, I deny freewill in man, I deny good workes, I deny prayer for the dead, I deny Christ to be borne of a Virgin, I deny that he descended into hell, I deny the Communion of Saints, I deny the forgiuenesse of sins.* Thus *Beza*. To whose *denyalls*, I will make bold to add one more:

(r) Denyed by Beza, Caluin Knox, in whole Treatises.

(s) *Vide* the Surucy of the Booke of common Prayer.

(t) denied by Calu.n as appeareth by Schlusselb. in Theolog. Caluinist. libr. 1. fol. 60. and by D Willet in Synopsis. pag. 432.

(u) Coucl in his examen pag 63. 64.

(x) Vide Whitgifts defence, pag 259.

* See *Durans in cō-*

to

fut. resp. ſ. Whitakers ad decem rationes Camp. rat. 10.

to wit: *I deny, that* Beza, *houlding theſe Negations, can be ſaued*. And thus theſe former Men, who as afore did *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and *Bucer*, much vaunt of their proficiēcy in this their *negatiue* controlling of the Romane Church: for *Caluin* being expoſtulated by ſome how endles he and his ſect were in going out from their former proceedings, thus ſalueth the point:

(y) Caluin. lib. de ſaīdal. extant in Tract. Theolog.

(y) *They do, as if a man ſhould accuſe vs, that at the firſt breaking of day, we ſee not yet the Sunne, ſhining at noone day.*

But what? Is not *Proteſtancy* come yet to its ἀκμή, and perfection of its *negatiue Reformation* by all the former Proteſtants? No verily. For the Proteſtants *Reformatiō*, in regard it is neuer at an end, is like herein to *Eternity*, which is euer ſpending it ſelfe, and yet ne-

uer

uer lessens. For in this next place step in the *Brownists*, and the *Anti-trinitarians*, both of them challenging to themselues a new *Reformation*, euen in the *Negatiue part*. Thus do the *Brownists*, for exaple, *deny* the (z) *Lords prayer*, and (a) *Baptisme of Infants*, which they say, is the marke * *of the Beast*. They also deny our (b) *materiall Churches*, & (c) *Vniuersities*.

To conclude with the *Anti-trinitarians*, they yet vrging a further *Negatiue Reformation*, do heervpon *deny* the *blessed Trinity*, and *diuinity of Christ*; condemning the Catholike Article of the *Trinity* for the *most notable relique, or brand of all Romish corruption*: for thus M. *Hooker* writeth hereof: (d) *The Arians in the reformed Churches of Poland, thinke the very beliefe of the Trinity, to be a part of Antichristian*

(z) Barrowes booke in his discourse agaynst Vniuersities.

(a) See Halls Apology. sect 30. agaynst the Brownists.

(b) Hall *vbi supra.*

(c) Barrows *vbi supra.*

*In Hals descript. to the Separat. before the Epistle dedicatory.

(d) M. Hooker in his Ecclesiasticall policy lib. 4. pag. 183.

corruption &c. Hitherto of the Protestants *Reformations* of the Catholike and Romane fayth, and all this by meere *Negatiues*: I meane *Negatiues* to the *Affirmatiue* cõtrary Articles taught by the Church of Rome; from whence we may well inferre, that the fayth of a protestant in regard of such his *Negatiue* Religion, is a meere wast, & deuastation of all true fayth, and that his beliefe consisteth only in not belieuing.

Now that the Iudicious Reader may more fully and intensly obserue, how many Articles of our Catholike Religion the Protestãt *denyeth*, I will heere amasse the chiefest of them together, though most of them haue beene aboue expressed, that so the Reader may haue a full *Synopsis* or sight of them all at once. The Protestant then

denyeth

denyeth the *Reall presence*, the *blessed Sacrifice of the Masse*, the *visibility of the Church*, *the Churches freedome from errour*, *the succession of Pastors*, *vniuersality of grace*, *freewill*, *praier to Saints*, *Purgatory*, *prayer for the dead*, *Pilgrimages*, *diuers parts of Canonicall Scripture*, *Papall Iurisdiction of Bishops*, *power of Priest-hood to remit sinnes*, *Monasticall life*, *vowed chastity*, *single life of priests*, *prescript fasting-dayes*, *the Grace and Necessity of Baptisme*, *fiue Sacraments*, *Christs descending into Hell*, besides some others. So wholly *negatiue* are the Protestants in all the Articles controuerted at this day, between them and the Church of Rome. Neither can our Aduersaries reply, that they hould diuers *Affirmatiue* points, ventilated at this day betweene vs and them, we retayning the *Negatiues*; as for exā-

ple: *Parity of Miniſters*, *Mariage of Prieſts, and other Votaries*, *Reprobation*, *Chriſts only Mediatorſhip by way of interceſsion*, *Chriſts ſuffering in ſoule &c.* To this I anſwere, that theſe poynts are *Affirmatiue* in words, but meerly *negatiue* in ſenſe, (like ſome drugs, which are pleaſant in the taſt, but dangerous in the operation) ſince they are *negatiues*, to the *Monarchy of the Churches gouernment*, *to vowed chaſtity*, *to Vniuerſality of Grace*, *to the interceſsion of Saints*, *and to the all-ſufficiency of Chriſts corporall death*: all which our Catholike points are *Affirmatiue*. Such is the ſubtility of Innouatiõ in doctrine, as to inueſt their *Negatiue Tenets* in *Affirmatiue* Titles, that thereby they may ſeeme more ſpecious & regardable. And thus farre concerning the foreſaid *Prolegomena*.

That

That the Protestants haue often corrected and reformed their Translations of the Bible, and the Liturgy or Common-booke of prayer, in fauour of their Negatiue Religion; euery later excepting agaynst the former, as corrupt and impure.

CHAP. III.

I Will subnect to the former *Prolegomena*, this passage following; which is to shew, that after our Protestants had newly moulded their Religion by their pure-impure *negatiues*; then instantly their next labour was to make new Translations of the Holy Scripture, and to reforme their publike *Liturgy*, or booke of Common prayer, according to their afore chosen *negatiue* Religion. And as

the Protestants at seuerall times more & more reformed their Religion by increase of *Negatiues*; so they also at the said seuerall tymes made new Translations of the Bible, and set forth new bookes of Common-Prayer, euer sortable to their last *negatiue Reformation*. Thus we see, how this censuring and reforming humour is the very eye, comportment, and carriage of *Protestancy*. From which course of theirs the iudicious Reader may obserue the preposterous method taken by the Protestants heerein. For whereas themselues do teach, that fayth and Religion is to be extracted out of the true & infallible sense of the Scripture (& consequently that their iudgements in the Scripture) ought to be knowne, & to precede in tyme before faith, yet with thē the faith

was first established, and then the Scripture was after by their Trãslations, squared to their fayth. Thus with them it fell out, that the Scripture was true in such, and such a poynt, because it confirmed by their translation, their new assumed *negatiue* fayth; and not that their fayth was true, because it was consonant to the Scripture, before it was so translated by them: so making their fayth the square of the Scripture, and not the Scripture the square of their fayth. But to come first to the seuerall Translations of Scripture, the later euer condemning the former, as not sufficiently translated in full defence of their *negatiue* Positions. And first *Luther* trãslated the Scripture presently after his open reuolt and Apostasy. This translation was as the first much admired

(so blazing starres at their first appearance, are much gazed vpon) yet because it warranted many *affirmatiue* Articles of our Catholike fayth, neuer *denyed* by *Luther*, therefore *Zwinglius* doth in great acerbity of words traduce him for such his Translation, thus inueighing against him: (a) *Thou, Luther, dost corrupt the word of God, thou art seene to be a manifest corrupter and peruerter of the holy Scriptures.* Now by reason of *Luthers* presumed false Translation, a new Translation was after set forth by the Deuines of Basill; which trãslation was neuertheles wholly cõdemned by *Caluin* & *Beza* (as not fauouring inough their *negatiue* Fayth) for thus *Beza* writeth thereof: (b) *The Basill Translation is in many places wicked, and altogeather different from the mynd of the Holy*

(a) Zwingl. tom. 2. ad Luther. lib. de Sacram. pag. 412. 413.

(b) Beza in resp. ad defens. & respons. Castal.

Ghost. Heerupon a third translation of the Scripture was made by *Caluin* and *Beza*, wholy presumed to be according to the holy Ghost; yet it is found so defectiue & impure, that *Molinæus* (a learned Protant) putteth vpon it this *Theta*, or marke of cõdemnation: (c) *Caluin in his Harmony maketh the text of the Gospell to leape vp and downe; he vseth violence to the letter of the Gospell; and besides, he addeth to the text.* The same Protestant thus also auerreth of *Beza*; (d) *Beza* actually *changeth the Text.* And thereupon instãceth in diuers of *Beza* his corruptions. But *Castalio* (the remarkeable Protestant) is not afrayd to reprehend *Beza* his Translation in this full manner: (e) *To note the errours of that translation, would require a great volume.* Finally *Castalio* himself composed a translatiõ,

(c) *Molin. in sua Trãslat. Noui Testam. Part. 12. fol. 110.*

(d) *Ibid. part. 20. 30. 40. &c.*

(e) *In defens. Trãslat pag. 170.*

yet ſo defectiue and impure, that *Beza* (by way of recrimination) condemneth it (to vſe *Beza* his owne words) (f) *as Sacrilegious, wicked, and Ethnicall.* And thus much for ſome taſt and delibation of our forayne Proteſtants Translations of the Scripture; ech later translation accuſing the former for imperfect and impure, as not being *Negatiue* inough in behalf of their *Negatiue* Religion: *ſo certayne it is that the very pulſe, life, and energy of Proteſtancy are meere Negations.*

(f) *Beza in Teſtam in præfat. & in Annot. in Math 3. in 1. Cor. 8. &c.*

But before we end this poynt, we will caſt our eye vpon our *Engliſh* Translations of the Bible, and ſee what entertaynement they find at the hands of other more reformed and *Negatiue* Proteſtants: for though diuers *English* translatiõs haue beene made of the Bible (the later euer condéning the former,

for

for not being reformed or *negatiue* inough; yet the Puritans (whoſe grace chiefly reſteth in diſgracing their Predeceſſours, and who are moſt deuoted to this *negatiue* faith) condemne all the ſayd translations, as falſe and impure. For *Carleile* (the Puritan) thus cenſureth them: (g) *The Engliſh Tranſlations haue depraued the ſenſe, obſcured the Truth, and deceaued the ignorant; & in many places, they do detort the Scripture from it right ſenſe.* And other Engliſh Puritanes do vomit out their iudgement of the Engliſh translation in theſe wordes: (h) *A Tranſlation, that taketh away from the Text, that addeth to the text, and that ſometymes to the changing and obſcuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt.* And heerupon they ſollicited the late King for a new tranſlation, which was granted to them, and

(g) Carleile, that Chriſt deſcēded not into Hell pag. 116. 117. 118. & ſequent.

(h) Abridgement of the booke giuen to his Maieſty, by the Miniſters of Lincolne Dioceſe.

bowells

and after publiſhed by authority. But how can we reſt aſſured, that they wil vnchangeably ſatisfy théſelues with this laſt translation, & will not in tyme be as earneſt for another? Now, let vs deſcend to their often alteration of their publike *Prayer-booke*, made by the aduice of *Crammer*, *Peter Martyr*, *and Bucer*; and as the *Statute* ſayth (i) *made by the ayde of the holy Ghoſt.* This prayer-booke retayned diuers *Affirmatiue* points of the Romane and Catholike Religion: for it (k) admitted *Baptiſme by lay Perſons in tyme of neceſsity*, as alſo, *grace giuen in that Sacrament*; in like ſort it retayned *abſolution of the ſicke penitent*, *giuen by the Prieſt*, *in theſe wordes*: *By authority committed to me*, *I abſolue thee of all thy ſinnes*: & accordingly it retayned *ſpeciall cõfeſſion of the ſicke penitent.* It further allowed

(i) In the ſtatuts of 2. 3 Edward 6. cap. 1.

(k) All theſe (with diuers other Catholike points) are expreſly ſet downe in the booke of cõmon-prayer, printed in folio by Edward Whit-Church, *cum priuilegio ad imprimendum ſolum anno* 1549.

allowed the *anointing* of the sicke *Penitent*; It maintained the *consecration of the water of Baptisme with the signe of the Crosse*. It also retayned the *vsage of Chrisme*, and of the *childs annointing*, and *of Exorcisme*. Briefly (to omit many other dogmaticall and *Affirmatiue* points of the Romane fayth and Religion) it maintayned *prayer for the dead, and intercession, and offering of prayers by the Angells*.

But this *Liturgy*, or Booke of common Prayer, was houlden during the reigne of Queene *Elizabeth* ouer Papisticall, as ech man knowes. And therupon the sayd Praier-booke was reformed in her tyme, and made more *Negatiue*, by culling out of it the former *Affirmatiue* Catholike points; yet this was not done in so full a manner, as it gaue contentment; for

Maister Parker thus complaynet
thereof: (l) *The day-starre was no*
risen so high, in their dayes, when ye
Queene Elizabeth reformed the defect
of King Edwards Communion booke
&c. (m) *yet so altered as when it was*
proposed to be confirmed, to the Parla-
ment, it was refused. To whose iud-
gement *Cartwright* (the Puritan)
thus subscribeth: (n) *the Church of*
England changed the Booke of common
Prayer, twice or thrice, after it had
receaued the knowledge of the Gospell.
And yet the last change made is so
imperfect in the iudgement of the
Puritanes, as that they (wishing
a new Common prayer booke to
be composed) thus censure of the
former: (o) *The forme of the commu-*
nion booke is taken from the Church
of Antichrist, as the reading of the
Epistles and Ghospells &c. the most
of the prayers, the manner of mini-
string

(l) against Symbolizing part 2. cap. 5. sect. 2. pag. 4.

(m) Ibid. sect. 17. pag. 39.

(n) Cartwright in his 2. Reply, part. 1. pag. 41.

(o) In Whitgifts defence. pag. 474.

string Sacraments &c. of Confirmation &c. Neyther are our Puritanes lesse forbearing to charge the Cō-munion booke (as being in their iudgement ouer *Affirmatiue*) for thus some of them do write: (p) *Many things in the Communion booke are repugnāt to the word of God.* And agayne: *In the Communion booke there be things, of which there is no sense, there is contradiction in it, euen of necessary and essentiall points of Religion.* And vpon this their dislike the Puritans at the (q) Conference at *Hampton* Court, motioned, that they might not be forced to subscribe to the Communion Booke.

(p) In the booke intituled: *The petition of twenty two Preachers in London.*

(q) Pag. 58

In this last place let vs examine a litle the *Liturgy* of the *Brownists*. This their forme of Prayer is so *Negatiue*, as that reiecting all other matters, it chiefly consisteth, *of an extemporall conceaued Prayer*, sin-

ſinging a Pſalme, and a *Sermon*. And yet the ſinging of a *Pſalme* was in doubt once to be taken away by ſome of the *Browniſts*, as being but a *humane Inuention*; and thereupon ſome of them do ſtyle, *ſinging of Pſalmes in the Church*, (r) *howling of wolues*, *croking of Rauens &c.* By all this we may ſee, how variable and inconſtant the Proteſtants haue diſcouered themſelues to be in admitting of the Booke of common Prayer: which point *D. Doue* (an eminent Proteſtant) as making a recapitulation of ſeuerall formes of their Communion booke, thus writeth: (s) *Concerning the Booke of Common Prayer, when the Maſſe was firſt put downe, King Henry had his English Liturgy, and that was iudged abſolute, and without exception: but whē King Edward came to the Crowne, that was condemned,*

(r) In the bobke called, *the new age of old names cap. 23. p. 122*

(s) Perſuaſions to Engliſh Recuſants pag. 31.

and

and another in the place, which Peter Martyr, and Bucer did approoue, as very consonant to Gods word. When Queene Elizabeth began her Raigne, the former was iudged to be full of imperfections, and a new deuised, and allowed by consent of the Clergy. But about the middle of her raigne, we grew weary of that Booke, and great meanes haue been made to abandone that, and establish another. Which although it was not obtayned, yet we do at the least at euery change of Prince, change our booke of Common Prayers: we be so wanton, that we know not, what we would haue.

Thus plainely and fully D. *Doue* of this point. And thus much to shew, how the Protestants and their descendants haue made seuerall Translations of their Bible, and composed diuers formes of Liturgy, or Common-prayer; e-

nery later Translatiõ of the Scri-
pture, and euery later forme o
Common-prayer, being more *Ne-*
gatiue then the former. From al
which we may moſt certainly con-
clude (and ſo extract Truth out
of falſhood) that as yet the Pro-
teſtants haue neuer enioyed a ſin-
cere Translation of the Scriptu-
res, or an Orthodoxall *Liturgy*, or
forme of Common-prayer.

That Proteſtancy is a Non-Entity,
proued from the Principles of
Schoole Diuinity, and Philoſophy.

CHAP. IIII.

NOW after we haue mani-
feſted the former poynts,
which are but certaine gradual
ſteps to the mayne queſtion hee
to be intreated of; it followeth
that

that by the applying the sayd points to certayne acknowledged and receaued *Theorems*, and Principles of Schoole diuinity; we are to euict the certainty of our assumed *Thesis*, or Position; to wit, *that Protestăcy is a meer Non-entity.*

Wherefore for the better illustration of this subiect, we are to call to mynd, that the Schoolemen do teach, that (a) *Omnis res est vera, secundum quod habet propriam formam suæ naturæ.* And againe (b) *Vnumquodque sicut custodit suum esse, ita custodit suam veritatem.* Euery thing as it keepeth its essence or being, so it keepeth its truth. And yet more. (c) *Verum non potest apprehendi, nisi apprehẽdatur sub ratione entis.* Truth cannot be apprehended, but as it is apprehended, as a thing hauing a reall being. And hence it is, that they conclude: *Res quælibet vera est ab-*

(a) S. Thomas part. 1. qu. 16.
(b) S. Thomas vbi supra.
(c) S. Thomas vbi supra. vide Duriad. lib. 1. distinct. 20. q. 6. and Vigerius de anima cap. 2 sect. 2. & Aristot. in Metephys. 9.

solutè. Euery thing, in that it is a thing, is true. And againe in more expresse tearmes: *Fundamentum veritatis est entitas rerum. The foundation of truth is the Entity, or being of things.* With whome assenteth S. Austin, thus teaching (d) *verum est, id quod est.* From all which their last inference is, that: *Ens, & Verum conuertuntur. Euery thing that is, is true; and euery truth hath a reall Entity.* Now the maine source, frō whence all these scholasticall sentences receaue their spring, is, because euery *Entity*, or being, is frō God; (e) *who wholy made all things*; and that all *Truth* proceeded likewise from God, who is (f) *truth it selfe*.

(d) *Aug. in Soliloq. l. 2. cap. 8.*

(e) *Genes. 1.*

(f) *Iohn. 14.*

But now touching that, which is not; but only is a *priuation*, or *deny all* of that, which is; the Schoolmen further teach; (g) *Intelle-*

(g) *S. Thomas part. 2. q. 17.*

tellectus decipitur nō circa quid est, sed circa quid non est. The *vnderstading is deceaued, not about that, which really is, but about that, which is not.* And further: (h) *falsum est id, quod non est apprehendere, vt esse; & quod est non esse.* That *is false, which is not to be apprehended, as it is a thing, but as it is not.* And from hence they conclude, that of such defects and *priuations*, as *lying, falshood &c.* there is no *efficient*, but a *deficient cause*: and that all such proceede only from the Diuell, (i) *the father thereof.* And according heereto, your owne *Peter Martyr* thus truly discourseth: (k) *An euill thing hath no efficient but a deficient cause; if any will search out this efficient cause, it is euen like, as if he would see darknes with his eyes, or comprehend silence with his eares; which being Priuations, it is no need they should haue*

(h) S. Thomas vbi supra.

(i) Iohn. 8.

(k) Peter Martyr in Commō places in English. part. 1. c. 17. pag. 184.

efficient cauſes. Thus farre Peter Martyr; which ſaying is ſortable to the iudgment of (t) S. Auſtin himſelfe: ſo vndenyable a truth it is, that what is in it ſelfe *Nothing*, cannot proceed from God, who is but *One*, yet *All things*; moſt *ſimple*, yet contayneth in himſelfe, *eminenter*, the perfection of *All things*. And thus it is certaine, that he cannot make *nothing*, who yet of *nothing* made all *things*, ſince to make that, which *is not*, is not ſo much to make, as rather a *not-making*; to the performance whereof *Impotency*, not *Power* is required. Now from theſe former doctrinal ſpeculations in Schoole diuinity (acknowledged for true, euen by al learned Men, eyther Catholike or Proteſtant) it is vnauoydably cuicted, that all *truth*, which is (as is aboue demonſtrated) euer ap-

(t) Auſtin de ciuit. Dei lib. 12. cap 7.

pro-

prehended, *sub ratione entis*, *is positiue*; & therefore in reality of sense, euermore *affirmatiue*: as on the cõtrary side, that *errour*, or *falshood*, (which is no other thing, then a *denyall* of some truth) is vpon the same ground (and by force, and law of Contrarieties) alwayes *Negatiue*,

But to preuent the willfull or ignorant mistaking of our Aduersaries (for some men are of that liuor, and harsh morosity, as that they euen meditate how to contradict) my meaning heere is not that euery verball *Affirmatiue Proposition* doth containe in it selfe a truth of reall *Entity*; for it is willingly acknowledged, that Mans brayne doth often fabricate many *Chimera's*, and aëry Imaginations, which are depriued of all reality of true existence, or *entity* to sup-

port them. But this I maintaine (which is sufficiẽt to my designed end) that whatsoeuer is *true*, hath *entity*, and is in this respect euer *Affirmatiue*; & whatsoeuer is *false*, is but a *denyall* of a truth, & therfore (as hauing no reall Being) is euermore *negatiue*. And though it is in mans power, through a voluntary frame, and contexture of wordes, that falshood may be masked vnder *affirmatiue* tearmes, and truth vnder *negations*; yet if we looke into the reality of sense and true vnderstanding, the truth is euer *Affirmatiue*, and the falshood *negatiue*. To exemplify this; to say, *God is not cruell*, or, *Man is not blynd*: these Propositions, though they be in tearmes *negatiue*, yet they are in sense *affirmatiue*, onely as denying the negation of *Mercy* in God, and of *blyndnes* in man: so

on

on the contrary part, to ſay in *affirmatiue* tearmes, *God is cruell*, & *man is blynd*: though theſe ſayings be deliuered in ſhew of *affirmatiue* termes; yet if we do vnueyle them they are found to be in ſenſe and vnderſtanding meerely *negatiue*; ſince *cruelty* is excluſiue to *Mercy*, and *blyndnes* to *ſight*: and it is as much as to ſay in *negatiue* wordes, *God is not mercyfull*, or, *man cannot ſee*. Thus far of theſe ſpeculations. Now I draw from al theſe former grounds this vnauoydable Concluſion; to wit, that *Proteſtancy* (as it is *Proteſtancy*) I meane as it conſiſteth meerely of *negatiue* Propoſitions and *Tenets* (and to conſiſt only of ſuch, it is aboue demonſtrated) hath no true reality, or ſubſiſtency in it ſelfe, but is a meere vaporous, intentionall, & Imaginary Conceite, and conſe-

quently in it ſelfe falſe. For if things be only true, as they haue a reall *being*, and therin *affirmatiue*; and falſe, if they want ſuch a *being* and therin *negatiue* (as the former *Axiomes* of ſchoole diuinity doe moſt euidently teach: (how then can Proteſtancy, which conſiſts only in *denyals and negations*, which haue no being, be reall, or true? For what reality of being is there, in a *not-being of Purgatory, or in not praying to Saints*, & ſo of the reſt? and if there be no reality in theſe (as infallibly there is not) how then can Proteſtancy haue any Reality in ſelfe? And if it haue no reality in it ſelf, how then can it be really in the ſoule of man? For certaine it is, that what wanteth a *ſubſiſtency* in it ſelfe, muſt neceſſarily want an *exiſtency* in any other thing. Now I will conclude this

Chap.

Chapter, in assluring the Reader, that I rest halfe amazed, to see mē (presumed to be of Iudgement) thus to suffer themselues to be befooled by others (and this to the irreconciliable and interminable ouerthrow of their soules) by entertaining certaine aëry & empty Positions in lieu of fayth, obtruded vpon them, which in a finall and euen libration are found to be meerely a destruction, and annihilation of all faith: (m) *O insensati Galatæ, quis vos fascinauit!*

(m) Galat. 3. cap. 1.

The

The Non-entity of Proteſtancy, by by reaſon of its negations, proued from the like ſuppoſed example of a Philoſopher, denying moſt principles of Philoſophy.

CHAP. V.

SVch is the nature of preiudice of iudgement, as that it is better able to ſee its owne defects in a third point, wherein by reſemblance it may glaſſe it ſelfe, then in that, to which it is ſo much deuoted; like as the weakenes of our eyes can better endure the ſight of the ſun-beames reflected by the water, then in the body of the ſun it ſelfe. He that will not acknowledge the irreality, and *Non-entity* of the fayth of the Proteſtant, by his

his *denying* almost of all positiue Articles of Christian Religion defended at this day by the Church of Rome; let that man (if he be a scholler) seriously peruse ouer this ensuing Chapter, which treateth by supposall of a Philosopher, who should deny most parts of Philosophy, acknowledged and taught for true, by the famous Philosophers of all times. I haue made choyce purposely to insist in Naturall Philosophy; since *nature* is the subordinate Instrumét of *God*, first created by himselfe; or rather *nature* is *Gods great hand*, wherwith he sterres & gouernes this whole Frame and *Vniuerse*; euery *Cause* in *nature*, being as it were a *finger* of this *Hand*; and euery *Effect* of the cause, a print of the said *Finger*. Now then let vs, as they say, *ex hypothesi*, imagine a mã, who would vsurpe

vsurpe to himselfe the title of a naturall Philosopher, by only *denying* most of the positiue, and *Affirmatiue* Axiomes and principles in naturall Philosophy, some few of the chiefest excepted, taught by *Aristotle*; and all other learned Philosophers; and then let vs conclude, in the closure of all, what a strange Philosopher would this man be; and whether his Philosophy could truly deserue the name of Philosophy, or rather that it wold proue to be a meere *deny all* and wast of all true Philosophy. Let this mã, then I say, agree with *Aristotle*, that naturall Philosophy intreateth of a *corporeall substance*, animate or inanimate, with all his naturall causes, effects, and accidences: to wit, as it is subiect to mutation and change. Let him also grant, that there are Foure chiefe

chiefe parts of this naturall Philosophy: of which the first part concerneth the generall and common Principles of natural things. The second intreateth of the world, of the Elements, of their first and secondary *qualities*, of the cõposition of the bodies, through the mixture of the Elements and *first qualities*. The third part discourseth chiefly of *Meteors*. The fourth and last part disputeth *de Anima*, of the soule, and of its severall kinds or degrees, and faculties. Let vs suppose, I say, this man to agree with *Aristotle*, and al other chiefe Philosophers in these and perhaps in some other few *Affirmatiue head Theorems*, and principles of natural Philosophy, as the Protestant doth agree with the Church of Rome in some maine *Affirmatiue* Articles of Christia

Fayth,

Fayth. Yet withall, let vs suppo
this new Philosopher do *deny* mo
of other subordinate Positions
which *Aristotle* holdeth *affirma*
tiuely in all the sayd foure parts o
naturall Philosophy: as for exam
ple, touching the first part of thi
Philosophy, we will suppose, tha
he maintaines, that *Materia, forma,*
& Priuatio, are not principia rerũ na-
turalium; that there is no *Materia*
prima of the which a naturall bo-
dy is first generated, and into
which it is lastly corrupted: and
that this *Materia prima* is onely
a Philosophicall conceite, and fi-
ction. That there is not any *Mo-*
tus in that sense, as it is commonly
defined by the Naturall Philoso-
pher; to wit, to be, *Actus entis, quod*
est in potentia, quatenus est mobile. An
Act of a thing, which is in potentia,
as it is *moueable*. That, admitting
there

there were any such *motus*, yet that the diuision of *motus*, is not perfect, to wit, that there should be six kinds of motion: viz. *Generation, Corruption, Augmentation, Diminution, Alteration, and Lation.*

Let him also maintaine, that *Locus Physicus*, is not the *vltima superficies concaua corporis continentis immobilis primò*, but that it ought to haue some other definition giuen to it. Finally (to omit infinite other *Affirmatiue* Propositions in the first part of Naturall Philosophy) that *Tempus Physicum*, is not, *Numerus mensurans motum rerum mutabilium, secundùm prius & posterius*: that is; that tyme is not *space*, which is measured by the motion of the Heauens, & the Sunne, but that this definition is most false, and to be exploded.

Now in like manner to come

to the second part aboue specified of naturall Philosophy. Let vs further imagine, that this *all-denying Philosopher* maintaynes, that the *motion* of the heauens is not precisely *Circular*, and *Vniforme*. That, the particular *motion* of the spheres proceed neither, *ab intelligentijs*, nor *ab interna forma* of the heauens. That, *nihil est extra vltimum Cælum*. That, it cannot be proued, that a starre is *densior pars sui Orbis*; *the more thick, or grosse part of its Orbe*. That there are not any *Excentrikes*, or *Epicycles* in the *Orbs* of the Planets. That one and the same starre cannot haue two different *motions* at the same tyme, though these seuerall *Motions* be supposed to be made vpon different *Poles*. That the sphere of the fixed Stars, or the Sunne doe not moue at all, but in lieu hereof, the

Earth moueth, according to *Copernicus*; and that not the *Earth*, but the *Sun* (according also to his opinion) is the *Center* of the world. That the starres do not borrow their light and splendour originally from the Sun, by meanes of their opacity, & thicknes of their substance, receauing into it the beames of the Sunne. That the *foure Elements* are not the Principles or secondary matter of all naturall bodyes. That the *forme* of all the Elements is not *spherical*. That there is no such *Symbolisme* in the qualities of the Elements, as *Aristotle* teacheth to be. That the Elements do not consist onely *ex similibus Homogeneis*, but also *ex partibus Heterogeneis*. That the element of fyre is not placed aboue the highest region of the Aire. That there are not three Regions of the

Aire, or if there be, that the mid
region is not cold, *per antiperistas*
That there is no transmutatiõ
the elements of one into another

To come to the third pa
of naturall Philosophy. As firs
let him maintayne, that there a
not fiue distinct species of co
pounded, or mixt bodies, to wit
Meteors, *Mineralls*, *Plants*, *Liuin*
Creatures, *and Man*; but that the
are, eyther more, or fewer. Tha
a *Vapour*, is not the matter of w
try *Meteors*, and an *Exhalation* o
fiery *Meteors*. That *Snow* is no
euer ingendred in the lowest regi
of the Aire, and *Hayle* in the mid
Region only. That the cause o
Thunder, and raine following it,
not an exhalation set on fire; be
ing encompassed within a watery
clowd. That the *Moone* by castin
its beames vpon the Sea, and wa

its heat dilating and spreading the exhalations, mixt with the Sea-water, is not the cause of the *flowing, and ebbing of the Sea.*

To descend to the last part of naturall Philosophy, which chiefly treateth of the *Soule*: And first let him iustify (among other things) that the Soule (heere we speak aswel *de anima vegetatiua, sentitiua*, as, *de anima rationali*) is not [illegible], that is, *the Act, Essence, or forme, by force whereof its naturall body is moued, and performeth its operations.* That man hath not one only *soule*, but three different *soules*; to wit, the *Vegetatiue*, the *Sensitiue*, and the *Rationall soule.* That *species sensibilis* is not euer required that by the help thereof, the external and internall sense should performe their operations. That the *Eye* (of whose artificiall na-

naturall fabrick or compacture
will ſpeake nothing) ſeeth not, ei
ther, *extramittendo*, or *intromitten-*
do, but by ſome other vnknowne
way, ordayned by God. That in
mans body the *Diaphrama*, or *ſep-*
tum tranſuerſum, ſerues not as a
partition-wall to diuide the *Concu-*
piſcible faculty, from the *Iraſcible*.
That, that Principle in *Anatomy*
is to be denyed, which teacheth
that *the Veines proceed from the liuer*
and giue nouriſhment, the Arteries
from the hart and giue life; the Sy-
news from the brayne, and giue mo-
tion and ſenſe. That in the Soule of
man, there are not two principall
faculties (to wit, the *vnderſtanding*
and the will) but that the operati-
on of both theſe are performed by
one only *faculty*: that the *Animall*
ſpirits are not firſt elaborated and
wrought in that connexion of the

sinewes, towards the *Cerebellum*, which is called, *Rete mirabile*; That the diuision of *Intellectus agens*, & *patiens*, is not to be admitted for good. That *anima separata* cannot exercise its operations, but during the time it is organized with the body. Finally (to omit infinite other *Affirmatiue* points maintayned by *Aristole*, and all other learned Philosophers) that there are not those seuerall *Naturall* habits in the soule of man, which all Philosophers ascribe to it; to wit, *Synderesis*, *dictamen Rationis*, & *Conscientia*; so as *Synderesis* should in euery *Sillogismo practico*, as it is called, *ponere maiorem*, *dictamen rationis*, *minorem*; *and Conscientia* out of the two former, *elicere Conclusionē*. Now to draw towards an end of this passage: if we suppose a man, as afore we intreated, to retaine

ſome few points or Principles in Philoſophy with *Ariſtotle*, and other great Philoſophers; but in moſt of the branches deſcending from theſe Principles wholy to diſſent frõ them, by maintaining euer the *Negatiue* part in thoſe Concluſions (as heere this Philoſopher doth) what ſhould we conceaue of ſuch a Philoſopher? and how poore, barren and naked a Philoſophy would this be? or can we truly iuſtify, that this Philoſophy (as wholy reſting in the *denyals & Negations* of almoſt all *affirmatiue* points, taught by *Ariſtotle* and others) hath any reality of *Being* in it ſelfe? No: for though this Philoſophy intreateth *Negatiuely* of things, which are *in rerum natura*; yet it ſelfe (for want of a *reall being*) *is not in rerum natura*. And yet ſuch is the ſtate of the Proteſtants

ceſtants herein, both being caſt in one mould. Therefore to parallell them both togeather, I heer ſay, that the Philoſopher heer ſuppoſed, reiects moſt of the *affirmatiue* points of Philoſophy: The *Proteſtant denyes* moſt of the *Affirmatiue* Articles of Chriſtian Fayth, The Philoſopher by this his *denyall* contemnes the authority of all chiefe Philoſophers, liuing within the compaſſe of theſe laſt two thouſand yeares: The *Proteſtant* by his like *denyalls*, betrampleſ the authority of al Orthodoxall Fathers, for theſe laſt ſixteen hundred yeares. The *Philoſopher* needeth not any pregnancy of iudgement as long as his Philoſophy reſteth only in *denyalls*: The *Proteſtant* neither needeth any ſupernaturall light, which is requiſred to true Faith to inſiſt in his *negations*.

Negations. To conclude, the *Philosopher* by these his *Negatiues* introduceth a waſt, and deſtruction of all true and ſolide Philoſophy: The Proteſtant begetteth by his *Negations* a deuaſtation, ruine, & vtter extinguiſhment of al reall & poſitiue Articles of Chriſtiã faith and Religion.

That the Heathen Philoſopher conſpireth with the Proteſtant in the denyall of moſt, if not all of ſuch points of Religion, wherin the Proteſtant by his like denyall of them differeth from the Catholike.

CHAP. VI.

IT will not be heer, I hope, impertinent, to ſhew in this place, how the *Heathen Philoſopher* co-

parteth

parteth in most points (for I will not say in all) with the Protestãts, in which points the Protestants do differ by their *negatiue Fayth*, from the Catholike fayth. From which, being once declared, it will appeare, that if he Heathen Philosopher hath no true and positiue Fayth of Christian Religion, who penetrateth no further, then into the Nature impressed in thinges, which nature is the very Art, or *Organ* of God; then may it be deseruedly called in question, whether the Protestant Fayth hath any reality, or formed *being* in it selfe? And thus may falshood be controwled by the patrons of falshood. And to exemplify this assumed taske, in most of the chiefest Articles of the Protestant *Negatiue* Fayth: The Protestant acknowledgeth not any true *real Sa-*

crifice

criſite to be in theſe dayes; the *Heathe Philoſopher* agrees with him therein. The *Proteſtant* acknowledgeth not *Freewill* in *man*; the *Heathen* teacheth the ſame, by maintaining of his *Stoicall fatum*, or *deſtiny*. The *Proteſtant* denyeth *Lymbus Patrum*, *Purgatory*, *and Invocation of Saints*; The *Heathen* being demaunded of theſe points, would anſwere, they are but meer dreames or fictions. The *Proteſtant denyeth* all *merit of workes*, or *Iuſtification by workes*, much more *Euangelicall Counſells*; The *Heathen* (as not knowing what theſe things meane) diſclaymes from the ſame. The *Proteſtant* taketh away *Vniuerſality of grace*, purchaſed by our Sauiours paſſion; The *Heathen* doth the like, ſince he is ignorant what *Grace* is, and reiecteth our Sauiours paſſion. The *Proteſtant*

teacheth

teacheth the *Impossibility of keeping the Commaundements*; the *Heathen* not acknowledging the sayd *Commandements*, but guided only by the streame of *Nature*, without *Grace*, must therefore of necessity *deny* the possibility of obseruing them. The *Protestant* maintaineth, that *Christ from his Nativity was a man, not free from all ignorance, and full of all knowledge*; the *Heathen* not beleiuing in Christ, must needs iustify the same. The *Protestant denyeth* all *reuerence, and bowing in the name of* IESVS; the *Heathen* doth the same. The *Protestant* deuyeth, that the *Sacraments do conferre Grace*; the *Heathen* acknowledgeth no *Sacraments*, and therefore no *grace* to be deriued to man by his participating of them. To conclude, the *Protestant denyeth all Monachisme, Vowes, the necessity of*

Bap-

Baptisme, and diuers other Affirmatiue Positions; aboue recited, and taught by the Catholike Church; Will the *Heathen Philosopher*, think you, acknowledge as true, any of the layd Catholike points? Thus we see, that where the *ratio formalis of Protestancy*, consisteth in absolutely *denying* the *Affirmatiue* positions of the Catholikes; this vnbelieuing *Naturalist*, or *Heathen Philosopher*, by his like *denyall* of the said points entreth into a most straite league, and intercourse of Friendship with the Protestant therein. And from this great conformity of *negatiue Fayth* betweeth the *Heathen* and the *Protestant*, it ryseth, that diuers Protestants do wholy gentilize heerein, granting Saluation, and eternall happines to *Heathens*, dying *Heathens*. Thus for example, we find no lesse an

obscure

obscure Protestant, then Swinglius to write in this sort; (a) *Ethnicus si piam mentem domi fouerit, Christianus est, etiamsi Christum ignoret.* And thereupon Swinglius concludeth particularly, that (b) *Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, &c. viue now in heauen.* A poynt so confessed by Swinglius, that Eccharius, alias named Protestant, thus acknowledgeth of Swinglius; *quod* (c) *Socrates, Aristides, Numa, Camillus, Hercules, Scipiones, Catones, & alij Ethnici omnes compartiripes sint cum æterna vita, verbis quidem Swinglij, sed Regem Galliæ, quem defendimus Papistis, Lutheranis, Heidelbergicis &c. That these named Protestants, I meane, (d) Gualterus, (e) Bullingerus, (f) Simlerus, & the Tigurine Ministers did defend with Swinglius, the saluation of the Heathens, dying Heathens, appeareth sufficiently by*

(a) Zuinglius epist. Swingl. & Oecolamp. lib. 1. pag. 39.

(b) Swingl. tom. 2. fol. 118. & 559.

(c) In his Fasciculus Controuers. printed Lipsiæ. anno 1609. cap. 19. p. 527.

(d) Gualterus in his Apolog. pro Swingl. fol. 27. præfix. 1. tom oper. Swingl.

(e) Bullingerus in confess. Eccles. Tigurin. & Bullin. in his preface of allowãce to Swingl. his exposition *fidei ad Regem* fol. 559.

from

(f) Simlerus in vita Bullingeri.

from the testimony of the forlaid *Echardus*, euen from the reference heer set downe.

Now, where the Protestant, to vindicate his profession from reproach and contumely, may reply, in answere heerto; that seeing most of the poynts aboue rehearsed do presuppose beliefe in *Christ*, in which beliefe the *Protestãt* doth differ from the *Heathẽ Philosopher*, the *Heathen* not beleeuing in him: it therefore must of necessity follow, that the *Heathen Philosopher*, as not beleeuing in *Christ*, must therefore not beleeue the former Articles, which depend of the beleeuing in *Christ*. I vrge. This answere is impertinent, for I doe not heere insist in the reason, why the *Heathen Philosopher* holdeth the *negatiue* part in the former poynts: but I insist onely in auerring that

the *Protestant* doth agree with the *Heathen Philosopher* in the *denyall* of the sayd points, affirmed by the Catholike. Neither auaileth it any thing to say, that thogh the Protestant houldeth the *negatiue part* in the former conclusions; yet that he believeth with the Catholike in *Christ*; that he houldeth with him, *there is Grace, that there are Sacramẽts, that there is Scripture &c.* though in the mãner, or some other circumstance accompanying them, he differeth frõ the Catholike. This soluеth not the doubt. First, because we obserue that *Swinglius*, & those other Protestants aboue cited, do not exact any articulate belieſe in *Christ* at all, as necessary to saluation; since we see, they are not afrayd to indenize *Heathẽs* for good *Christians*. Secõdly in that I restraine this my Asser-

tion of cõparing the *Heathen Philo-*
sopher with the Protestant only in
those poynts, wherein the *Prote-*
stant differeth from the Catholike.
But in the former poynes, it is cer-
tayne, that the *Heathen* agreeth
with the *Protestant*, and the *Prote-*
stant as maintayning the *Negatiue*,
differeth from the *Catholike* defe-
ding in them the *Affirmatiue*. A-
gaine, where the *Protestant* agreeth
with the *Catholike*, for example,
that *Christ is the Sauior of the world,*
that there is Scripture, Grace, Sacra-
ments, Baptisme, Eucharist, &c.
these Articles in general the Pro-
testant houldeth not, as he is a
Protestãt, but only as he is a *Chri-*
stian (as in the front of this Trea-
tise is manifested.) For *quatenus he*
is a Protestant; that is, *quatenus he*
is a man differing from the Catholike,
he euer houldeth the *Negatiue*.

And

And euen where he houldeth *the Affirmatiue foundation in some of the sayd points*; as that *Christ is the Sauiour of the world*, *that there is Diuine Scripture*, *Grace*, *Sacraments*, *Baptisme*, *Eucharist &c.* these he taketh not from himselfe, but borroweth them from the Catholike Church. This is euidēt, for at the tyme of *Luthers* first reuolt (who was the first Protestant in these dayes, as his owne (g) brethren do teach) from whence did Luther learne, that Christ was the Sauiour of the world, that there is diuine Scripture, Grace, Sacramēts; or from whence receaued he his Ordination, if not from the Catholike Church?

The confessed *Inuisibility* of the Protestāt Church, not only at the first rising of Luther, but also for many ages before (proued in this

(g) Conrad. Sluſ. in Theol. Caluin. l. 2. fol 17. saith: *It is impudency to say, that any learned men in Germany before Luther, did hould the doctrine of the Gospel.* See Luther of this points *in loc. cōm. class. 4. p.* 51.

Treatise) doth conuince the truth of this point. And therefore D. *Field* had iust reason to say, (b) *In the known Church of the world, wherein our Ancestors liued and dyed, Luther and the rest were baptized, receaued their Ordinance and power of Ministry.* If now any other should at last expostulate and say, that the *Protestant* is wronged by comparing him to the *Heathen Philosophers*, seeing many of those Philosophers were Idolaters; to this I reply, and say, that the comparison heer made, is not with such wicked *Philosophers*, but only with those most learned *Philosophers*, who acknowledged a *Deity*, and neuer taught, nor formally practised Idolatry: and such were *Plato*, *Xenophon*, *Aristotle*, *Seneca*, and many others. Againe the cõformity in faith heere made is not

(b) D. Field in his Treatise of the Church lib. 3. c. pag. 72.

touching those points, which the Philosophers *affirmatiuely* belieued or practised; but only in such *negatiue Positions*, which are also *denyed* by the Protestant. And with this I will heere rest, concluding nothing of my selfe; but will referre it to the censure of the most iudicious Reader: whether this great affinity, and brotherly association between the learned *Heathen Philosopher*, and the *Symbolizing Protestant* in their both promiscuously *denying* such Articles, as are affimed by the Catholiks, do carry any blemish to the Protestants Gospell, or no? or whether if the *Heathen* haue no reall Fayth in the sayd *negatiue* points, it followeth not, that the *Protestant* (as a *Protestant*) can haue in like sort no reall fayth in his belieuing the same *Negatiue* points? But by this

we may discerne, that the clouds of partiality and contradiction being once gathered about the mans iudgment, doth make him thinke others to seeme lesse, and to erre, when indeed they doe not.

That Protestancy is but a Nullity of fayth, and consequently, with reference to fayth, a Non-entity; proued from the definition of faith, and other Conditions necessarily annexed to Fayth.

CHAP. VII.

EVery *definition* of a thing is the Touchstone, wherewith we try, what other things can truly come within the *Orb* or cõpasse of the thing defined, & what not. I will exemplify this in the definition of fayth, deliuered by the Apostle,

postle, and so see, if the Fayth of a Protestant can be called fayth; or rather in respect of Faith, a *Nõ-entity*, & absence of fayth.

We finde that the Apostle defineth Fayth in these wordes: (a) *Fides est sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium.* That is: *fayth is the substance of thinges to be hoped for, the argument of thinges not appearinge.* This definition sheweth (by the iudgement of all learned men) that Fayth is a supernaturall vertue; and the *obiectum* thereof is that, which through its owne abstruse and sublimity cannot be apprehended or conceaued by force of mans owne wit, in transcending all naturall reason. To exemplify this in the supreme Articles of the most *blessed Trinity*, and the *Incarnation*, the two Cardinall mysteries of Christian

(a) Heb. 11.

fayth) Fayth teacheth vs, that in the *Trinity*, there is one peculiar *Nature*, in three *different Persons*. Now mans naturall vnderstãding cannot apprehend, how this *Individuality* of *Nature* can be in *three Persons*, without distraction or multiplication of the *nature*; & the rather seeing euery one of these *Persons* is identifyed really & formally with this *Nature*; the strickest vnion, that can be conceaued. In like sort touching the *Incarnation* (by meanes whereof the Creatour of all flesh, suffered in flesh) mans reason cannot lay any true ground to conceaue, how one *Hypostasis*, or person cã be in two *natures*; or how this *Hypostasis* or person is identifyed, & made the same really with the *diuine nature*, and yet is vnited most inwardly with the *humane nature*. Thus in regard

of the difficulty of believing Articles of fayth, the conclusion among all the Schoole Deuines (resulting out of the former definitiō of Fayth) is, that (b) *quæ fidei sunt, non possunt, esse scita*: so certayne it is, that betweene mans Capacity, and the Nature of supernaturall Fayth, the proportion lyes onely in disproportion; and that in matters of fayth, euen reason dictates to vs, to believe against Reason. Now to apply this; if Protestancy be a supernaturall fayth (or els it is no true-saving fayth) then the *Obiect* of this Protestantican fayth, is of that difficult nature, as Man through the force of natural reason cannot give any assent thereto without the special concurrency of Gods Grace.

(b) S. Thomas part. 2. q. 1.

But heer now I demaund; that seeing the *Obiect* of *Protestancy* (as

Protestancy) is meere *negations*, and *denials* of things to be (as aboue is proued) what *supernaturality*, as I may terme it, or force of Gods speciall concurrency is required, that man should giue his assent to believe, that such, or such a thing is not? as for example; that there is *no Purgatory, no place but Heauen for children dying vnbaptized, no praying to Saints, no inherent Iustice*, and so of the rest denyed by them? I heer say, that mans naturall reason euen of it selfe (without any other externall help) is propense & inclining to giue assent to these & all other *negations*, except the *affirmatiues* to these *negations*, can be conuinced for true, either by diuine or humane proofes and authorityes: so litle is any supernaturall assistance needfull heerto.

If then the *obiect* of Protestancy

by

by reason of its *Negations*, be most easy to be believed, and that the belief of it doth not surmount the force of mans naturall reason, but rather most sorting and agreable thereto; then if the Apostles definition of Fayth be true, (as I trust no Protestant is of that supercilious and froward disposition, as to *deny*) it followeth, that *Protestancy* is not the *Object* of Supernaturall Fayth: but, in respect of true & infused fayth, is a *Non-entity*, and bare *Intentionality*

But to proceed further: The Schoolemen (c) teach, that true, and Supernaturall Fayth hath a necessary reference to two things; the first is called *prima veritas revelans*, which is God: who reuealeth all truths & points of fayth. This first is styled by the diuines, *Obiectum formale fidei*. The second

(c) S. Tho. part. 2 q. 8

ſecond thing required to Fayth, (eſpecially after the Church of Chriſt was once eſtabliſhed) is the *Authority of the Church*; and this is called *Amuſis, regula, or the Propounder*. This propoundeth to her children to be believed, all thoſe things, which God reuealed to the Church to be believed. Now let vs examine, whether theſe two points ſo neceſſary to true fayth, doe accord to the fayth of *Proteſtancy*, or not. And firſt, touching *Prima veritas reuelans*, which is *God*; I here ſay, that no reuelation of God, touching the beliefe of things meerely *Negatiue*, as the points of *Proteſtancy* are, as afore I intimated, is neceſſary; for who will ſay, that we cannot believe, that there are not *many worlds*, without the ſpeciall reuelation thereof by God? Seeing we perceaue,

perceaue, that children, Heathēs and Infidels who (while they continue in that their state) are not capable of Gods supernaturall reuelations, do not belieue, that there are *many worlds*? By the same reason then I say, that no reuelatiō of God is necessary to giue assent of iudgement, that there is no *Purgatory*, no place *in Hell for Children vnbaptized*, *no inherent Iustice*, no praying to *Saints*, and so of the rest of the Protestants *Negatiues*.

Now, as touching the second poynt, which is the *Authority of the Church*, propounding to her Children the things by God reuealed; we know, that in this our age *Luther* was the first, who denyed many Articles of Catholike Religion: heer now agayne I expostulate, what Church did propound

pound to *Luther*, that these poinꝭ were to be *denyed*, and that the Articles of true Faith consisted in such *denyall* of them? It cannot be sayd, the Catholike Church propoũded them to him to be *denyed*; because the Catholike Church did then, and at all tymes believe the *Affirmatiues* to them, as true: *as that there is a Purgatory, that we may pray to Saints &c.* And to say, that the Protestant Church did propound to *Luther* the denyall of the sayd poynts, is most absurd. Seeing at *Luthers* first bursting out, and his first *denying* of the sayd poynts, there was no Protestant, but himselfe; and therefore no Protestant Church then, was but in being. The verity of which point (besides that it is heerafter prooued frõ the acknowledged inuisibility of the Protestãt Church

those dayes) is euicted euen from the ingenuous Cõfessions of learned Protestants: for thus doth *Benedictus Morgensternensis*, a Protestant, conteſt of this point, saying: (d) *It is ridiculous to say, that any before Luther, hath the purity of the Gospell.* And vpon this ground it is, that *Bucer* styleth *Luther*, (e) *the first Apostle to vs of the reformed doctrine.* Marke you not, how our Aduersaries do subtily make the stiles, of the *Gospell*, of the *Apostle*, of the *reformed doctrine &c.* to serue as certayne veyles or curtains, to hide their bad cause frõ the eyes of the ignorant? Thus far to demonstrate both from the definition of Fayth set downe by S. *Paul*, and from points necessarily concurring for the causing of true fayth, that *Protestancy in regard* of its want of true supernaturall fayth

(d) Tract. de Eccles. p. 145.

(e) In lib. Apolog. of the Church. part. 4. c. 4.

fayth; is but an absolute *Nullity* of fayth.

That Protestancy cannot be defined and that therefore it is a Non-entity.

CHAP. VIII.

EVery thing, that hath a real Existence or *Being*, may have its nature explicated by the definition of it; so as euery true & real thing is capable of being defyned. This *definition* consisteth of two parts: to wit, of *Genus* and *Differentia* (as *Logick* teacheth.) the *Genus* doth comprehend the Essence of the thing defined, the *differentia* or some other Proprieties in lieu thereof, doth more particulerly constitute the thing defyned, and distinguisheth it from all o-

ther

other things : for example : *A man* is defined to be, *Animal rationale*; *A liuing Creature, enioying Reaſon.* Heere the word *Animal*, demonſtrates the Eſſence of *Man*. *Rationale* doth conſtitute man in definition, and maketh him to differ from all other ſublunary Creatures. Now then if *Proteſtancy*, or a *Proteſtant* cannot be defyned, for want of *Genus*, and *differentia*; then wanteth it a true Eſſence, and is but an *Intentionall notion* of the mynd.

To defyne a Proteſtant in theſe wordes; (thereby to ſet the beſt glaſſe vpon their Religion) *A Proteſtant is a Chriſtian, who beleueth the Articles of Fayth, according to the true ſenſe of the Scripture.* This indeed is a ſpecious *definition*, ſeruing only to lay ſome fayre colors vpon the rugged grayne of *Proteſtancy*,

ſtancy, and but to caſt duſt in the eyes of the ignorant. But withall this *definition* is moſt falſe for ſeueral reaſons. Firſt becauſe though a Proteſtant be a *Chriſtian*, yet *quatenus* he is a *Proteſtant*, the word *Chriſtian* is not *genus* to him, as aboue is ſaid: for the word *quatenus* (implying a reduplicatiue formality) hath reference not to the *Genus* in a definition, but only to the *differentia*, as aboue is noted. For the word *Proteſtant*, (as is formerly declared) is a word only of *diſtinction*, thereby to make him differ from the Catholike: but in the word *Chriſtian*, they both accord and agree. Agayne, euery different Sect or Hereſy will maintaine with as great venditation & confidecy, as the *Proteſtant* doth, that its Religion or Hereſy is agreable to the true ſenſe of the Scripture: & will

vye with the Proteſtant, text for text of ſcripture (by detortiō of it) for the ſupporting of its hereſy; as we find by the exāple of the *Ariās*, *Eutichians*, *Pelagians*, & the reſt, who euer fraught their peſtiferous writings with an aboūdāce of ſcripturall authorities. And the like courſe doe our later Heretikes alſo take, to wit, the *Brownists*, *the Family of loue*, and the *Anti-trinitarians*: ſo true is that ſentence of old *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*: (a) *Si quis interrogat quempiam Hæreticorum, vnde probas, vnde doces hoc? ſtatim ille: Scriptum eſt enim.* Thus we ſee, that thoſe wordes, to wit: *who beliueth the Articles of fayth, according to the true ſenſe of the Scripture*, ſupplying the place of *differentia* in the former *definition*, may be applyed to all ſects indifferently (if their owne Interpretation of Scripture

(a) Contra hæreſ.

pture may take place) aſwell as to the Proteſtant. And therefore as being of too great an extent, it doth not diſtinguiſh a *Proteſtant* from any other Sectary: & yet the nature of a true *definition* requireth, that the *definition*, and the thing *defined* ſhould be of an equal expanſion and largenes; that is, that the *definition* and the thing *defined* ſhould conuertibly be affirmed, the one of the other. Laſtly I ſay, that this former *definition* of a *Proteſtant*, or *Proteſtancy*, is but a meer *Paralogiſme* or Sophiſme, called *Petitio Principij*, being but a poore and needy begging of the thing, as proued, which ſtill remaynes in controuerſy. For I eternally deny, that *Proteſtancy* is according to the true ſenſe of Scripture. And this deny all our learned Catholike deuines haue ſufficiently

cientlỹ iustifyed and made good in their writings, against the Protestant.

Now then, this former definition being deseruedly exploded; the neareſt *definition*, or rather *description* is to pencill it out in theſe wordes: *Protestancy is a Religion, which consisteth in the denyall of the Reall presence, denyall of the Sacrifice of the Masse, denyall of freewill, denyall of Purgatory, and so in the deniall of the many other Articles, iointly denyed by the Protestants*. But here againe this *definition* is moſt defectiue: for heer alſo *the differentia constitutiua*, which ſhould conſtitute *Protestancy*, and withall diſtinguiſh it from other Religions, is wanting: firſt becauſe *Negations*, and ſuch is the *differentia* heer ſuppoſed, cannot cõſtitute any thing: for only *Entia* (and *Entia*, bare *ne-*

gations are not (giue a constitution and being to *Entia*. Agayne, the presumed *differentia* in this definition (to wit, the *denyall of the Real presence, denyall of free wil &c.*) stretcheth it selfe by way of application to other Religions, aswell as to *Protestancy*; for the *Turkes*, the *Iewes*, and the *Heathens* deny these former points with as strōg a bent of contradiction, as the *Protestant* doth: and so accordingly conspire vnanimously with the Protestant in such denyals. Thus then we see, that this Imaginary *differentia*, in this second *definition*, is ouer generall, and of too great a latitude, and doth not distinguish the *Protestant* from *Turkes*, *Iewes*, and *Heathens*.

Well then to contract this point, seeing euery thing, that hath any reality of being, can haue its nature

ture and Essence truly dissected by *definition*, or *description*; And seeing *Protestancy* cannot be defined (for how can that be called a formed and positiue fayth, which in it selfe is meer *priuatiue*) then followeth it, that it cannot be knowne, what *Protestancy* in it self truly is: and if *Protestancy* cannot be knowne what it is, then is it to be reputed a *Non-entity*. Yet to close vp this Chapter, and in some sort to be officious, & seruiceable to our Aduersaries, my *definition* of *Protestancy* shall for the tyme be this: to wit, *a Religion, which incorporates in it selfe the Negatiue doctrines of the Ancient stigmaticall Heretikes*, as heerafter will be demõstrated; or, if you will: *A Religion, whose definition consisteth, in that it cannot be defined*. And thus *Protestancy* only is, *in that it is not*.

That Proteſtancy conſiſteth of doctri-nes meerely contradictory in them-ſelues: and that therefore Prote-ſtancy is a Non-entity.

CHAP. IX.

PHiloſophy inſtructeth vs, that what truly implyeth in it ſelf an abſolute *contradiction*, the ſame hath no *Entity* or being. The reaſon whereof is this: what implyeth a *Contradiction*, ſuppoſeth a *Being*, and a *Not-being* of a thing, and all at one and the ſame tyme: from whence then this abſurdity would follow; to wit that if ſuch a thing could be, then could a thing be, whoſe *being* ſhould conſiſt in a *Not-being*: and conſequently ſhould be an *Irreality* and *nothing*. An vnwarrantable errour, ſince God

God, to whome it is more easy *to doe* then *not to doe*, cannot effect or make any such thing; for euery thing that is, ought in some sort to beare a likenes to him, from whome it proceedeth. But that which hath no *Being*, and in it selfe is *nothing*, cannot beare any resemblance to him, who giueth life, & Being to euery thing; (a) *In ipso viuimus, mouemur, & sumus.* (a) Act. 17.

This Philosophicall Axiome extendeth it selfe not only to the existence, or want of existence in things corporeall or material, but also to the *Being*, or *not-being* in things speculatiue & immateriall; I meane in doctrines, and other such *Theories* of the vnderstāding. Since then it wil easily be proued, that *Protestancy* in many poynts is compounded of seuerall *contradictory*, and opposite doctrines

& *Tenets*; & ſuch, that though all may be falſe, & conſequently haue no reall *Being*, yet that of neceſſity the one part muſt want all reality of being for its owne ſupporting; then vnauoydably it may be concluded, that *Proteſtancy* (as cõſiſting of ſuch irreconciliable doctrines) wanteth all reality, is in it ſelfe, and is but a *Non-entity*.

I will exemplify this in a poynt or two, wherein the *Proteſtants* agree only in diſagreeing. The firſt ſhalbe touching the *Nature of the Sacraments*. All, or moſt of the Proteſtants do conſpiringly *deny* our Catholike doctrine therein, in teaching, that they *cõferre grace*; but after their vnanimous *denyall* thereof, then they preſently by imbracing of contrary doctrines, diſſent amongſt themſelues (like lines, which once meeting in one

common

ommon Center, instantly breake
f, and runne (euerall wayes:) for
winglius teacheth, that the Sacra-
ments in generall, are *bare and na-
ed externall signes*; and is therefore
ondemned by (b) *Caluin*: but *Cal-
un* by ascribing more to the Sa-
craments, then to *externall signes*,
s (by way of retaliation) condem-
ned by (c) *Swinglius*.

(b) Lib. de Cœna Dn. & lib. 4. Instit. cap. 15. sect. 10.
(c) Epist. ad quandã Germaniæ ciuitatem. fol. 286.

In like sort, The Protestants do disauow all *iustification by workes*, yet most of them hould, that good workes ought *necessarily to accompany a iustifying fayth*. But to crosse this, *Luther* (after he once became setled in the lees of sensuality) thus writeth: (d) *It is impiety to affirme, that fayth, except it be adorned with Charity, iustifyeth not.* Yea further he sayth, (e) *fides nisi sit fine &c. except fayth be without good workes, it iustifyeth not &c.*

(d) So saith Luther vpon the Galat. Englished in cap. 1.
(e) Luther tom. 1. propos. 3.

O the calamity of theſe Canicul
and vnlucky dayes, in which euc
doctrinally, and religiouſly (as
may ſay) is exiled all practiſe o
Religion, and good workes. A
gaine touching the *Real preſence* i
the Euchariſt; all the Sacramen
taries diſclayme from our doctrin
therein: neuertheles diuers emi
nent Proteſtants, as (f) *M. Hoo*
ker, (g) *D. VVhitakers*, and (h) *Cal*
uin himſelfe do teach, the Man
ducation of Chriſts true and Reall
body in the *Euchariſt* by the mouth
of fayth. Yet is this doctrine who
by diſallowed by (i) *Peter Martyr*,
though Peter Martyr be therefore
reciprocally controuled by *Bucer*
in his *Scrip. Anglic. pag.* 548. a
inclining (to vſe his owne wordes)
too much to Popery. It is in like ſort
condemned for the moſt part, by
our (k) Engliſh Puritanes. Now

(f) lib. 5. Eccleſ. Polit. ſect. 67.
(g) Contra Duræum pag. 168.
(h) Caluin lib. 4. Inſtit cap. 17 ſect. 7.
(i) In his Epiſtles annexed to his Commō places, engliſhed epiſt. 25.
(k) In their Chriſtiā letter to M. Hooker.

to

o turne our Pen a litle backe v-
on theſe three former points: in
he firſt we find theſe two contra-
ictory poſitions: *The Sacraments*
re only bare externall ſignes: And,
he Sacraments are more then exter-
all ſignes. In the ſecond: *Good wor-*
es are neceſſary to accompany fayth:
And, *Good workes are not neceſſary*
o accompany faith. In the third: *the*
rue and reall body of Chriſt is taken
n the Euchariſt, with the mouth of
ayth: And, *the true and reall body*
of Chriſt is not taken in the Euchariſt
with the mouth of fayth. Now what
more true *Contradiction* can there
be in Poſitions & *Tenets* of fayth
then theſe are? ſeeing (as the Na-
ture of *Contradictions* requirt)
they all haue a true reference *ad*
Idem. From whence it then fol-
loweth, that the one ſide at leaſt,
if not both, in theſe former con-

tradi-

tradictions hath no reality or tru
ſubſiſtence of Being. And heere
upon then I conclude, that ſinc
all theſe former alledged men ar
accepted by the Church of En-
gland, as good Proteſtants; and
all their meere contrary doctrine
in the former poynts are taught
for good Proteſtancy; that there-
fore Proteſtancy as conſiſting of
ſuch *contradictory* doctrines (whoſe
nature requires a *Not-be ng* of one
poynt) is no reall, and truly ſubſi-
ſting fayth, but a meere *Chymera*,
and *Non-entity*.

The points of Proteſtancy, tou-
ching which the Profeſſours of
Proteſtancy, and eſpecially the
Caluiniſts amongſt themſelues, do
ſo diametrically differ, are (amõg
others) theſe following: *VVhether
God doth decree and will ſinne*, or but
only *permit ſinne? VVhether the Cr-*
will

will Magistrate may be head of the Church? whether (as aboue is intimated) *the body of Christ be truly and substantially present to the mouth of fayth*, or, *but Sacramentally only present? whether in case of Adultery, the innocent party may marry againe? whether the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, and the Vse of the Surplisse be lawfull? whether Bishops be Antichristian, or lawfull? whether Christ suffered in soule the paines of Hell?* besides many others. The different *Tenets* in all which doctrines are so repugnant and *contradictory* one to another (& yet all is good Protestancy as before is sayd, and all the maintainers of the contrary doctrines reputed for zealous Protestants, and Professours of the Gospell) that euen by the law and nature of *Contradictories*, the one syde must euer want a reall & subsisting

siſting *Being*; and thereupon it fol-
loweth, that Proteſtancy as com-
pacted of ſuch contrarieties in do-
ctrine, muſt be in it ſelfe a very
nothing. This diſcrepancy and *An-
tipodes-like* treading of our aduer-
ſaries in Articles of Proteſtancy, is
made more manifeſt by recalling
to mynd, what is aboue ſet down
touching the great & violent diſ-
ſentions of the Proteſtãts, concer-
ning their tranſlatiõs of Scripture,
& their booke of Common praier.

But leauing that (as aboue tou-
ched) the ſame will likewiſe be
made euident, by remembring in
what acerbity of ſtyle, the Prote-
ſtants haue writ one againſt ano-
ther; euer intimating thereby,
that the different doctrines diffe-
rently maintained by them, were
truly *Contradictories*; and there-
fore the *Tenets* of the one ſyde at
least

least, meere irreall, as wanting all true *Being*.

But to contract this poynt, I will particulerly insist (as most conducing to the subiect in hand) first in setting downe the expresse words (in their owne dialect) of the English Protestants, and the English Putitanes; and after I will put downe some few tytles of Protestants Bookes, written one against another; from which the Reader may euen depose, that the different protestanticall doctrines maintained in those different bookes, against other Protestants defending the contrary, must of necessity be in themselues *contradictory*, and incompatible one with another.

But to begin with our English Protestants. And first we find *M. Parkes* thus to write of the Puri-

tanes: (l) *They are headstrong, and hardened in Errour; they strike at the mayne points of fayth, shaking the foundation it selfe, and calling to question Heauen and Hel, the diuinity and Humanity, yea the very Soule, and Saluation of our Sauiour himselfe.* And yet more in the same place: *The Puritanes haue pestilent Heresies &c. They are Hereticall and sacrilegious.* M. Powell thus styleth the Puritanes: (m) *They are notorious & manifest Schismatikes, cut of from the Church of God.* The Archbishop of Canterbury thus blazeth them: (n) *The Puritanes do peruert the true meaning of certaine places both of Scripture and Fathers, to serue their owne turne.* Now the Puritanes on the other syde are ready to repay the Protestāts former curtesy in their owne lāguage; for thus they write: (o) *Do we vary from the sincere doctr*

(l) In his booke dedicated to the Archbishop in Epist dedicatory.

(m) Powel in his cōsideratiōs.

(n) In the Suruey of pretended discipline cap. 5. & 2. & 4.

(o) In the defence of the Silenced Ministers supplicatiō to the high court of Parlament.

e of the Scriptures? Nay rather many
f them (meaning the Bishops & heir adherents) *do much swarue om the same &c.* And agayne (p) *he worship in the Church of Englād corrupt, superstitious, vnlawfull, epugnant to the Scriptures. The Ar-cles of the Bishops Religion are erro-ous, their rites Antichristian.*

(p) This appeareth in the booke of Constitutions, and Canons Ecclesiasticall, printed. āno 1604

By this we may discerne, what mutuall recrimination, and what reconciliable repugnancy there betweene the English moderate rotestant, and the Englisſh Pu-tan; and this euen in great mat-rs, and of highest consequence: nd therefore the former *M. Parks* onfesseth sincerely and ingenu-sly of this point, thus saying: *The Protestants deceaue the world, d make men belieue there is agree-ent in all substantiall points: They firme, there is no question among the*

(q) M. Parks vbi supra p. 39

of the truth. And this much touching our domesticall Protestants and Puritanes.

In the next place I will descend to forrayne Protestants, and for greater breuity, among many hundred of bookes, written by Protestants against Protestants (see heer the (t) *Ægyptian set against the Ægyptian, ech one fighting against his brother;*) I will content my self with setting downe the titles only of ten of them. From which Titles the Reader may infallibly conclude, that the Controuersies (being the subiect of those bookes) are not of that *adiaphorous*, and indifferent nature, as that the *Tenets* of both sydes might be true; but that the Patrones of both sides did hould *contradictory* doctrines; and such (as that granted (by supposall) the truth and *Being* of

(t) Isa. 19.

the one part, the other of necessi-
ty wateth all reality of *Being*. And
to begin.

1. *Ægidij Hunnij Caluinus Iudaizãs: Hoc est, Iudaicæ glossæ & corruptelæ, quibus Ioannes Caluinus illustrissimæ Scripturæ sacræ loca & testimonia, de gloriosa Trinitate, deitate Christi, & Spiritus sancti &c. detestandum in modum corrumpere non abhorruit.* Wittenberg. anno 1593.

2. *Alberti Graueri Bellum Iohannis Caluini, & Iesu Christi.* brapæ. 1598.

3. *Oratio de incarnatione filij Dei, contra impios & blaspemos errores Sxinglianorum, & Caluiuistarũ.* Tubingæ anno 1586.

4. *Anti-paræus; Hoc est refutatio venenati Scripti à Dauide Paræo editi, in defensione strophbarum & corruptelarum, quibus Ioannes Caluinus illustrissima Scripturæ testimonia,*

of the truth. And this much touching our domesticall Protestants and Puritanes.

In the next place I will descend to forrayne Protestants, and for greater breuity, among many hundred of bookes, written by Protestants against Protestants (see heer the (t) *Ægyptian set against the Ægyptian, ech one fighting against his brother;*) I will content my self with setting downe the titles only of ten of them. From which Titles the Reader may infallibly conclude, that the Controuersies (being the subiect of those bookes) are not of that *adiaphorous*, and indifferent nature, as that the *Tenets* of both sydes might be true; but that the Patrones of both sides did hould *cotradictory* doctrines; and such (as that granted (by supposall) the truth and *Being* of

(t) Isa. 19.

the one part, the other of necessi-
ty wateth all reality of *Being*. And
to begin.

1. *Ægidij Hunnij Caluinus Iudaizãs:*
Hoc est, Iudaicæ glossæ & corruptelæ,
quibus Ioannes Caluinus illustrissimæ
Scripturæ sacræ loca & testimonia, de
gloriosa Trinitate, deitate Christi, &
Spiritus sancti &c. detestandum in
modum corrumpere non abhorruit.
Wittenberg. anno 1593.

2. *Alberti Graueri Bellum Io-*
annis Caluini, & Iesu Christi. brap-
æ. 1598.

3. *Oratio de incarnatione filij*
Dei, contra impios & blaspemos erro-
res Sypinglianorum, & Caluiuistarũ.
Tubingæ anno 1586.

4. *Anti-paræus; Hoc est refu-*
atio venenati Scripti à Dauide Pa-
æo editi, in defensione strophарum &
orruptelarum, quibus Ioannes Calui-
us illustrissima Scripturæ testimonia,

de mysterio Trinitatis, nec non or
la Prophetarum de Christo, detestan
dum in modum corrupit. Francofur-
ti. 1598.

5. *Denominatio Impostura*
& fraudum, quibus Aegidius Hun-
nius Ecclesiæ orthodoxæ doctrinam pe-
tulanter corrumpere pergit. Brem
1592.

6. *Guillielmi Zepperi Dillinber-*
gensis Ecclesiæ Pastoris institutio, de
tribus Religionis Summis Capitibus,
quæ inter Euangelicos in controuersiam
vocantur. Hanouiæ 1596.

7. *Veritatis victoria, & ru-*
na Papatus Saxonici. Losannæ 156

8. *Christiani Kittelmanni de-*
cem graues & pernicioſi errores Swin-
glianorum, in doctrina de peccatis &
Baptismo: ex propriis ipsorum libris
collecti, & refutati. Magdeburg.
1562.

9. *Pia defensio aduersus Ioan-*
nis

nis Caluini, Petri Boquini, Theodori Bezæ, Guillielmi Clebitij, & similium calumnias &c. Erfordiæ 1583
10. *Apologia ad omnes Germaniæ Ecclesias reformatas, quæ sub Zwingliani & Caluiniani nominis invidia, vim & iniuriam patiuntur.* Tiguri. 1578. And thus farre heereof, whereby we may see, that Protestancy is deadly wounded by the Pen of Protestancy.

Heere now I close vp this chapter, referring to the iudgement of the learned Reader, that seeing *Protestancy* is compounded of seuerall *Contradictory* Doctrines, (wherof the one side must of necessity be depriued of al reall *Being*) and seeing the nature of true faith exacteth, that it should be cõplete, entire, and perfect in it selfe; like therein vnto an action morally vertuous, which is accomplished

by the acceſſe of all due conducing Circumſtances, but vitiated through the abſence but of any one: and finally ſeeing that all the former repugnāt doctrines of the Proteſtants (beſides many others of like nature by them maintained, for breuity heer pretermitted) are accounted Euangelical, and true Proteſtancy; whether it doth not indiſputably, and dirrepliably follow, that *Proteſtancy* in it ſelfe is no true fayth, but in reſpect thereof an abſolute *Irreality*, and, but an *Intentionall Name*, or word?

That

That Heresy, as being a Priuation, is Non Ens; and consequently, that Protestancy (as consisting of the old condemned Heresies) is a Non-Entity.

CHAP. X.

IN one of the precedent Chapters it hath beene made euident, that *Protestancy* euen from the title of *Negation*, hath no reality of Being: In this place now the same shalbe euicted from the Title of *Priuatiõ*; where for the clearer apprehending of this point, we are to call to mynd (as aboue is touched) that euery *Priuation* is but a defect of that, which should be, (thus is blyndnes, of sight, & deafenes, of hearing) and therefore as hauing no *efficient cause*, but on-

ly a *deficient*, proceedeth not from *God, who made all things*; and consequently, it is *Non Ens*. But to passe on further. Among those things, which are *Priuations*, we doe finde, that euery Heresy is ranged or marshalled in that Classe; and this deseruedly; since *Heresy* is but a *Priuation* or *denyall* of the truth; but all truth proceedeth from God, (a) *Ego sum Veritas*, and consequently *Heresy is a meere Non Ens, or Nullity*.

(a) Iohn 14.

This being presumed as true and vncontroulable, if then I can proue, that *Protestancy* is but a *colluuies* of the ancient Heresies condemned in the Primitiue Church, it then followeth vnauoydably, that *Protestancy* (as compacted of those *priuatiue* and *Negatiue* Heresies) is but a *Non-entity*.

But to effect this (and therein con-

consequently to discouer frō what vnworthy Fathers, the Children of our new supposed Gospell are lineally proseminated and descended, sucking from them, *tanquam ex traduce*, the venome of their *Priuatiue* and *Negatiue* fayth) I will appeale herein to history of former ages; by meanes whereof our times hould intelligence with Antiquity. I will exemplify this in seuerall *Negatiue points* of Protestancy. And first we find that the Protestants borrow their *denyall* of the *Reall presence*, from certayne old Heretikes in (a) *Ignatius* his tyme) so early we see the Cockle grow vp with the good seed) as *Theodoret* witnesseth; yet the *affirmatiue* is houlden both by *Ignatius*, and the whole Church of those daies. 2. The said heretiks denied, that any (b) *Visible Sacrifice* ought

(a) So affirmeth Theodoret dialog 3.

(b) Ieronim. epist. ad Hebidiā.

to

ly a *deficient*, proceedeth not from *God, who made all things*; and consequently, it is *Non Ens*. But to passe on further. Among those things, which are *Priuations*, we doe finde, that euery Heresy is ranged or marshalled in that Classe; and this deseruedly; since *Heresy* is but a *Priuation* or *denyall* of the truth; but all truth proceedeth from God, (a) *Ego sum veritas*, and consequently *Heresy is a meere Non Ens, or Nullity*.

(a) Iohn 14.

This being presumed as true and vncontroulable, if then I can proue, that *Protestancy* is but a *colluuies* of the ancient Heresies condemned in the Primitiue Church, it then followeth vnauoydably, that *Protestancy* (as compacted of those *priuatiue* and *Negatiue* Heresies) is but a *Non-entity*.

But to effect this (and therein con-

consequently to discouer frō what vnworthy Fathers, the Children of our new supposed Gospell are lineally proseminated and descended, sucking from them, *tanquam ex traduce*, the venome of their *Priuatiue* and *Negatiue* fayth) I will appeale herein to history of former ages; by meanes whereof our times hould intelligence with Antiquity. I will exemplify this in seuerall *Negatiue points* of Protestancy. And first we find that the Protestants borrow their *denyall* of the *Reall presence*, from certayne old Heretikes in (a) *Ignatius* his tyme) so early we see the Cockle grow vp with the good seed) as *Theodoret* witnesseth; yet the *affirmatiue* is houlden both by *Ignatius*, and the whole Church of those daies. 2. The said heretiks denied, that any (b) *Visible Sacrifice* ought

(a) So affirmeth Theodoret dialog 3.

(b) Ieron. epist. ad Hebidiā.

to

to be now in the dayes of Christianity.

(c) Lib de hæres c. 33.

3. The *denyall of* (c) *Prayer for the dead*, is first taken from the Heretikes *Aerians*, who (as S. *Austins* words are) thought it vnlawfull *orare, vel offerre pro mortuis.*

* Aug. vbi supra.

4. The *denyall of freewill* taken from the *Manichees*, of whome S.* *Austin* thus writeth: *Peccatorum originem non tribuunt Manichæi libero arbitrio.*

(d) Ierom. lib 1. & 2. contra Iouinianum.

5. The *denyall of fasting, and of virginity* was first introduced by *Iouinian*, as (d) S. *Ierome*, and (e) S. *Austin* do witnesse.

(e) Aug. li. de hæres. cap. 82.

6. The *denyall of the Churches visibility*, broached by the *Donatists*, who taught with *Caluin*, that the Church consisted only of the Iust; and thereupon as not knowing, who were the iust, they made it *Inuisible*, as (f) *Austin* recordeth.

(ff) Aug. l. de vnit. c. 20.

7. The

7. The *denyall of worshipping the Reliques of Saints*, first taught by *Vigilantius* the Heretike, as (g) S. *Ierome* doth witnes.

(g) Ierom. contra Vigilant.

8. The *denyall of the distinction of mortall and veniall sinne*, first mantayned by the *Pelagians*, as (h) S. *Ierome* testifyeth.

(h) l. con. Pelagium.

9. The *denyall* of al worship due to the Image of *Christ*, *and his Saints*, first iustified by *Xenaias Persa*, as (i) *Nicephorus* recordeth.

(i) lib. 16. cap. 27.

10. The *denyall of the possibility of keeping the Commandements*, was first mantayned by certayne old Heretikes, recorded by (k) *Ierome*, and (l) *Austin*.

(k) In explicat. Symbol ad Damasum.

(l) De tempore serm. 91.

11. The *denyall of all reuerence to the Crosse*, was first taught by *Probianus* the heretike, as appeareth in the (m) Tripartite Hiſtory.

(m) lib. 20 cap. 13.

12. The *denyall of Traditions* was first taught by the *Arians*, as appeareth

peareth out of the book, written by (n) S. *Austin contra Maximum*. The same is also taught by *Nestorius* the Heretike, as we read in *Sexto Synodo*.

(n) lib. 1 cap. 2.

(o) Act. 1.

13. The *denyall of power to reconcile men sinning after Baptisme, by meanes of the Sacrament of Confessió*, was first taught by the *Nouatians*, as (p) *Theodoret*, and (q) *Eusebius* relate.

(p) lib. 3. de hæret.

(q) lib. 6. c. 33. Hist.

14. *The denyall of voluntary Pouerty*, and other *Euangelicall Counsels*, iustified by *Vigilantius*, as (r) S. *Ierome* witnesseth.

(r) l. contra Vigilantium.

15. The *denyall of Originall sinne* (especially in the Children of the faythfull) first taught by the *Pelagians*, as (s) S. *Austin* witnesseth.

(s) lib. 6. contra Iulianum. c. 2. & 3.

16. The *denyall of lawfulnes of vowes, of perpetuall Chastity &c.* first introduced by certaine Heretikes styled *Lampetiani*: as (t) S. *Damas-*

(t) lib. de centum hæres. circa finem.

cene

ene affirmeth.

17. To conclude, that the Primacy of Gods Church belonged only to Ecclesiasticall Persons, was *denyed* by *Constantius* and *Valentinian* Emperours, as witnesseth (u) *Athanasius*, and (x) *Ambrose*.

(u) *Athan. in epist. ad solitariam vitã agentes.*
(x) *Ep. 32.*

Thus farre of this poynt. And now (by the way) I referre to the more retyred & sober thoughts of the iudicious and learned Reader, whether it be not an irreparable dishonour & blemish to the Professours of the new Ghospell (in whome now liuing, the former dead Heretikes yet doe liue; or rather whose bodies (by a strange *Metapsychosis*) seeme to be organized with the soules of those old condemned men) thus to consociate with certaine old branded & anathematized Heretikes, by borrowing their *priuatiue* and *negatiue* fayth

fayth and religion from them; &
thereupon to dispare, and diuide
themselues from all communion
in fayth, with the Orthodoxall
Fathers of those pure and primi-
tiue tymes; whosoeuer in the for-
mer Articles set downe in this
Chapter, and in all others, did
hould the *Affirmatiue* part to the
others *Negatiue*: so foule a scarre
herby resteth vpon the face of our
Aduersaries reputation, and ho-
nour.

Now, that these former men
were recorded for heretikes, for
their *denyall* of the aboue cyted
Catholike Articles, and their *de-
nyals* taken for heresies; and that
the such recording of them was
warranted with the full consent
of the whole Church of God in
those tymes, appeareth from this
one consideration; to wit, those

Fathers

Fathers & writers, which did record the former men for heretikes, & their *negations* for heresies, were *Epiphanius*, *S. Ierome*, *S. Austin*, *Theodoret*, *Eusebius*, and some such others; diuers of which Fathers made certayne Bookes and styled them, *de Hæresibus*. And in these their books they registred the former men for *Heretikes*, & their *Negatiue* doctrines for *Heresies*. Now all these Fathers, and writers were learned & godly men: their learning then would assure them, what opinions were *Heresies* in those tymes, and what were not. Their Piety and Holynes would not suffer them, to wrong any man with the hateful brand of *Heretike*, or his doctrine with the foule title of *Heresy*, except both the men and their doctrines deserued such a seuere Censure. And it cannot

be answered in reply heerto; that the Catholike Church of God in those Primitiue tymes, did euer taxe, or reprehend any of the former Fathers, for ranging that man among Heretikes, or his doctrines among Hereſies, which were not taken for ſuch by the whole and vnanimous iudgement of the then Church of God.

Thus far to demonſtrate, that ſeeing *Hereſy* in its owne nature, is but a *Priuation*; and euery *Priuation* is a *Non Ens*; that therefore *Proteſtancy*, as being ingendred of the ancient exploded *Hereſies*, is a *Non-entity*.

That

That there are diuers positions of Protestancy, which (besides that they are implicitely but negations of the Catholikes contrary Affirmatiue doctrines) are in their owne nature meerly voyde of all entity of Being.

CHAP. XI.

IN this place we will take into our consideration diuers Articles of the Protestants Fayth, in the true examining of which we shall finde, that not only (as being but meer *negatiues* to our *affirmatiue* Catholike Articles) they haue no reall Existency, or being, but also as they are to be considered in their owne particuler natures.

And first, may occurre their Tenet of the *Priuate reuealing, or interpreting*

preting *Spirit*; which though in termes it beareth the show of an *Affirmatiue* position; yet truly it is nothing els, then the *denyall* & *negation* of the infallibility of the whole Church of God in matters of fayth. This *Spirit* comprehendeth in the amplitude & largenes of its owne *Orbe* most of the seueral passages of *Protestancy*. Now to examine the Essence and nature of this *Spirit*, exercised chiefly in interpreting of Scripture (if such an imaginary conceit could haue an Essence or nature, as indeed it cannot) we find that this *Spirit* is a meer Phantasy of ech particuler mans giddy head-peece. For if it were certayne and infallible (and so it must be if it proceed from the *holy Ghost*) how then commeth it to passe, that seuerall *priuate Spirits* of the Protestants do interpret one

one and the same Text of Scripture in different (and sometymes meere contrary) senses, and constructions? This point is demonstrated (to pretermit infinite other passages of Scripture) in the exposition of those few words, vttered by our Sauiour, *Hoc est corpus meum. Hic est sanguis meus.* As also, in that Article of our Creed, *Descendit ad inferos.* We find both these passages to haue receaued seuerall constructions by the Protestants; and from such their different constructions are sprung vp different sects of Protestancy, as the *Lutherans*, the *Caluinists*, the more *moderate Protestant &c.*

Matth. 26. Luc. 22. Marc. 14.

Agayne, to omit diuers other choaking reasons, to prooue this *Spirit* to be a meer phantasy of the brayne (ingendred of *Pride* and *Ignorance*) and to haue no reality or

true *Being* in itſelfe; how can this *priuate Spirit* be infallible, to which euery Heretike with equall intereſt thereto, coueteth chiefly to repaire, as to his ſtrongeſt Sanctuary; as we ſee by the experience of ancient and moderne tymes they do? For did not the (a) *Arians* (b) *Eutichians*, the (c) *Neſtorians*, & the reſt euer labour by the helpe of their owne *ſpirits*, differently interpreting the Scripture, to maynte their different blaſphemyes and hereſies? And do not the *Anti-Trinitarians*, the *Brownists*, the *Family of loue*, and diuers ſuch others, the like in theſe our tymes? So little reaſon therefore had *D. VVhitakers* to beautify this erroneous *Priuate Spirit*, with his gilded deſcription in theſe words; (d) *An inward perſuaſion of the Holy Ghoſt wrought in the ſecret cloſet of*

(a) teſte Epiphan. hæreſ. 69. Ioan. 8. 48. Ioan. 6.

(b) Ioan. 1. Ioan 2.

(c) Philip. 3. Hebr. 7

(d) In controuerſ. 1. q. 5. cap. 3 & 11.

the beliuers heart: and repugnant, is this his delineation to the words of sacred Scripture: (e) *No Prophecy of Scripture is made by priuate interpretation.* And againe: (f) *early beloued, beliue not euery spirit, but try the spirits, if they be of God.*

(e) 2. Pet. 1.
(f) 1. Iohn. cap. 4.

The second may be the (g) Protestants doctrine of *Imputatiue Iustice in vs*, being but a *negation* and *denyall* of the Catholike doctrine of *Inherent Iustice*; vpon which doctrine, the Protestant more easily relyes, since his owne soule euen dead-aliue, (as being organized with a liuing body, but a dead will) is loth to practise any good workes. Now, this *Imputatiue Iustice* is in it selfe, a meer *Ens rationis*, as hauing (contrary to the Nature of all diuine Vertues, and to all reall and true qualities) no true Existency, or Inherency in our

(g) Luth. in art. 10. 11 12. Melanct. in locis tit. de fide Caluin in Antidot. Concil. Trident. sess. 6.

Soule, as the Protestants do confesse: it being only a naked application of *Christs Iustice* to vs, whereby our sins are palliated and couered. Againe, if a man be iust whē he beginneth to belieue that he is iust; then is he not iustifyed by that, by the which he belieueth he is iust, seeing his fayth is later then his Iustice; And if he be vniust, at what tyme he belieueth he is iust; then is his fayth false, & consequently no supernaturall or diuine fayth, but a meer fiction of this supposed iust man: so vnreall imaginary a conceite (we see) is this *Imputatiue Iustice*: and indeed to mantaine it, is as absurd, as to mantaine, that the sonne can precede in priority of being his Father, or the effect, the cause: for thogh in all other things the truth of the opinion relyeth vpon the truth

truth of the matter; yet here the truth of the matter relyeth vpon the truth of the opinion.

The third poynt is the *actuall* fayth which (h) Luther, and the Lutheranes ascribe to infants, at that very instant, that they are baptized. Now cõmon sense and the force of reason assureth vs, that there is not, nor can be any such faith in childrẽ; but that this is in it self a meer *Chymera* & *Phãtasy*: for first doth not the poore Infãts strugling (what they can) in time of their bodies immersion into the water, manifestly impugne this aëry conceite? Since if at that instant they did believe, they should offend God by such their resistance; and so by this meanes they should commit sinne, rather then haue their *Originall sinne* remitted. Again, how can Infants

(h) Luth. in l. de capt. Babil. Kem. in 2. part. Exam. Concil. Trident. ad Can. 3. Centuriat. Cent. 1. c. 4. & Cẽt. 5. col. 518.

(i) Rom. 10 believe except they heare? (i) *Fides ex auditu*. Thus I leave to every one to iudge of what truth of *Being* or reall Existency this doctrine hath in it selfe. And thus farre of these former aëry speculations of doctrine, broached by the Protestants, though but briefly touched by me (for how can one well extend himselfe in discoursing of such points, which in thēselues do want al extension?) In the vnfoulding wherof, I labour not so much to display the falshood & absurdity of thē (which neuertheles incidently is by this meanes partly discouered) as to make euident, according to my methode vndertaken, that not any of the sayd Protestants Positions or *Tenets* haue any *Reality* or *Being*; but that they are meerely forged in the imagination, without ground or foundation

lation of any true and *Positiue* sub-
stence.

The last of the Protestant Po-
itions, (omitting diuers others
or greater breuity) in which I
will insist, shall be touching the
Protestant Church; shewing that it
s *Nothing*, in it selfe, but only a
Church framed in the ayre, and
ccordingly the Protestants are
forced couertly to discourse of it,
n a mist of darke wordes: so pain-
ers veyle that, which they cannot
delineate by Art. But since this
wil require a more large discourse,
branching it selfe into two parts, I
haue therefore purposely reser-
ued the two next Chapters, for the
fuller dissecting of the same.

That

That the Protestant Church is a meer Non-Entity, or Idea; proued from the confessed Inuisibility thereof.

CHAP. XII.

IN our entreating of the Protestant Church, first we are to recall to mynd the *definition* giuen thereof by the Protestants: secondly, the confessed *Inuisibility* of the sayd Church for many hundred yeares: from both which poynts the resultācy will be, that the Protestant Church (and consequently Protestancy, as mantained by the sayd Church) is but an vnreall thinge. And to beginne with the definition (a) *Caluin* defineth the true Church (and therefore in his owne iudgement the Protestant Church) *to consist only of the number of the faythfull &*

(a) Lib. Instit. 4. c. 1. Sect. 2. & in minori Instit. c. 8. Sect. 4.

Elect

lect, and only to be knowne to God
Now, what other thing is this Church, then a bare *Intention* (as the Philosophers speake) or phansme wrought in the shop of his owne brayne? for first, seeing no man can know, who be those other men, who are of the Elect, & who truly believe; how can it be knowne, who are the members, who make this Church, or where it is? Againe, this *definition* rather destroyeth, and taketh away the Church, then describes, or constitutes it. For if all the workes euen of the iustified, be *mortall sinnes* (as (b) *Luther*, and (c) *Confessio Augustana* do teach) and that if only the iust do make this Church, then followeth, that no man is of the Church; and consequently, that the Protestant Church thus defined, is but a meer *Platonicall Idea*; the

(b) *Luth. in Assert. art.* 32.
(c) *Art.* 6 & 20.

the reason heereof being, becau
there are no iust men in the wor
since the workes of men are sins
Next we will descend to the *Inui*
sibility of the Protestant Church
confessed by the learned Prote
stants, for many ages, or rathe
since the dayes of the Apostles
In handling of which point I wil
first set down the ackowledgmē
of the learned Protestants of thei
Churches *Inuisibility*; and then af
ter I will draw from thence the
necessary deduction of sequence
for prouing the Irreality, for aery
Intentionality of the Protestant
fayth, and Religion. And first it i
ouer euident, that *D. Perkins* thus
confesseth of the inuisibility of the
Protestants Church: (d) *For many*
hundred yeares our Church was not
visible to the world: An vniuersall
Apostasy ouerspreading the whole fac

(d) In his expositiō of the Creed.

of the earth. And yet more particularly he thus acknowledgeth: (e) *During the space of nine hundred yeares, the Popish heresy hath spread it selfe ouer the whole earth.* But *Sebastianus Francus* (a learned and very markeable Protestant) confesseth more largely of this point, thus writing: (f) *For certayne through the worke of Antichrist, the externall Church togeather with the fayth and Sacraments vanished away presently after the Apostles departure; & that, for these fourteene hundred yeares, the Church hath not beene externall and visible.* To whose iudgement D. *Fulke* (to omit for breuity the like Confessions of diuers other Protestants) subscribeth in these wordes: (g) *The true Church decayed immediatly after the Apostles tyme.*

(e) Perkins vbi supra.

(f) In epi de abrog. diuin. minister. inuen. omnibus sæculis: Ecclesiast.

(g) D. Fulk in his answere to a Counterfeyte Catholike pag. 35.

Now, to inferre, and deduce Conclusions: first then, if the

the Protestant Church hath ha
no *Being*, since the death of th
Apostles, (as we see by the ac
knowledgmẽts of the learned Pro
testants themselues, it hath no
had) but hath laine hid so many
yeares in a vast *Chaos* of *nothing*,
then followeth it, that the Prote
stant Church is only an Imagina
ry thing, hauing no *substantiality*
(as I may terme it) or existence
in it selfe. Secondly, I thus inferre
If the Protestant Church hath no
reall Being or existence in it selfe,
but is a poore *fabrick* of the imagi
nation; then followeth it vnauoi
dably, that the Protestant fayth
must necessarily partake of the
nature of the Protestant Church;
I meane, not to be any reall, or
subsisting thing. For how can that
faith be positiue or reall, of which
there haue beene for so many ages
con

ontessed (and indeed for all ages without exception) no meb̄ers of the Church to make profession of the sayd fayth? This I auerre, is absurd to maintaine; since we see a shadow cānot produce a shadow. Agayne, I adde heereto that (by reason of inherency) there is a necessary reference in euery *Accident* to its *Subiect*; if the *subiect* be wanting, then followeth it, that the *Accident* (as loosing its Inherency) is also wanting, and becommeth *Nothing*; now then Protestancy or the fayth of a Protestāt, suppose it be any thing, must be a *quality*, and consequently an *Accident*, inhering in the vnderstanding of the Professour: but if since the Apostles daies there haue beene no Professours of Protestancy, by reason of the Inuisibility of that Church for so many ages,

doth it not then follow, that
least during all those ages, Prote
stancy, as wanting its proper Su
iect to inhere in, hath had no re
Being; but hath beene all thos
many series, or Centuries of yeare
a meere *Nothing*?

That the confessed want of Personall Succession, and lawfull calling in the Protestant Church, proues their Church to be no reall thing but a meer fiction; and consequently, that Protestancy is but an Intentionality, or bare Notion of the mynd.

CHAP. XIII.

PHilosophy teacheth vs, that e
uery thing doth consist of
somewhat, which is essentiall to
it, and of other things, which are
but *Accidentall*, and necessary

The

The *Accidents* serue only, *ad bene esse*, and by meanes of Inherency do giue (as it were) their attendance for greater state and honour of the thing, the which they do inuest; and therefore may actually (at least in thought) be separated and disioyned from such their *subiect*, without any destruction of it. But it is otherwise with that, which is *essentiall* to any thing; for that necessarily conduceth *ad simpliciter esse*, of the thing; the which *Essentiall* poynt, being by supposall taken away, the thing whereof it was *Essentiall*, instantly looseth its *Being*, & is become therby a *nothing*. Now, to apply this to the Protestant Church. And to pretermit what *Accidentally* accompanyeth the Church, we will insist onely in that, which is by our aduersaries acknowledgemẽt.

Essentiall to the Church ; to wit the *Administration of the VVord and Sacraments*. Now, if it can be proued, that the Protestãt Church wanteth this *Administration of the word and Sacraments*, then may we infallibly conclude, that the Protestant Church is no Church, nor Protestancy any *Reall thing* in it selfe. But seeing this *Administration of the word and Sacraments* cannot be performed, but by the help of the true *Pastors*, we wil first shew the necessity of *Pastours* : secõdly, that the *administratiõ of the word & Sacraments are Essentiall to the Being of a Church* ; And lastly we will proue, that the Protestant Church (like a mastlesse ship) hath neuer enioyed any true *Pastours* ; & consequently neuer enioyed the *Administration of the word and Sacraments* ; the very *Essence* or *being* of

true Church.

And first, the holy Scriptures doe often inculcate, that in the Church of God there euer must be *Personall Succession, and lawfull calling.* & cõsequently that, that society of Christians, which want these two poynts, is no Church at all. Touching the necessity of *Personal Succession*, thus we read: (a) *My Spirit, which is vpon thee, and the words which I haue put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seede, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds seed, from henceforth for euer.* To which accord those wordes of the Apostle, spoken of our Sauiour: (b) *He hath placed Pastours to the consummation of Saints, till we all meete in vnity of faith.* That is, as the Protestants do comment, (c) *for euer*, and (d) *to the end of the world.* Now the reason

(a) Isa. 59

(b) Ephes. 4.

(c) So sayth Dr. Fulk. agaynst the Rhemish Testament.

(d) DFulk agaynst Heskins, Sanders &c. pag. 539.

son, why *Pastours* must be euer in the Church, or els it is no Church but only a false vsurpation of the word *Church*, is, because in the Church there euer must be, the *Administration of the word and Sacraments*: but there can be no *Administration of the word and Sacraments*, without *Pastours*, euen according to the Apostles iudgment, who sayth Rom. 10. *How shall they beleeue, whome they haue not heard? and how shall they heare, without a Preacher?* which things, to wit, the *Administration of the word, and Sacrament* (as (c) *D. Whitakers* teacheth) *being present do constitute a Church, being absent do subuert it.* And *D. Willet* in *Sinops.* pag. 69. further in direct words affirmeth. *That the absence of the Administration of the word and Sacraments doth make a Nullity of the Church.* And

(c) D. Whitaker contra Duræum, lib. 3. p. 462.

fortably

sortably heerto other Protestants do write thus: (f) *The ministery is an Essentiall marke of the true Church.* Frō which true acknowledgment of the learned Protestants, we see that a Church without the due *Administration of the word and Sacraments wanteth its Essence*, and is but a *Nullity*, or *Non Ens*. Now, as *Personall Succession* for the *administration of the word and Sacraments* is deduced from the Scripture; so also is the necessity of *Lawfull vocation*, according to those wordes: (g) *How shall they preach, except they be sent?* And that: (h) *No man taketh the honour of Priest-hood, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was*: which *calling* in the Apostles times was euer conferred by *Imposition of hands*. But heer let vs see if the Protestants can make good the *Personall Succession*, and *ordinary calling*

(f) Propositions and Principles disputed of in the Church of Geneua. pag. 845.

(g) Rom. 10.

(h) Heb. 5.

of their Ministers for the preaching of the *word, and Administration of the Sacramẽts*. But this is first denyed, euen by the confessed *Inuisibility* of the Protestant Church: for if the Protestant Church hath beene wholly inuisible, or rather vtterly extinct for the space of thirteene, or fourteene hundred yeares at the least, as themselues haue aboue confessed: thẽ during that long space of tyme, the Protestant Church (as not being then in *Being*) wanted her *Pastours*: the stalke, which supports the vine; and consequently wanted the *Administration of the word and Sacraments*, and through such its want, it wanted its owne *Essence*, and was but a *Nullity* or *Nothing*, during all that long Circuite of so many ages. Furthermore whereas the Protestants, seeing themselues thus

thus plunged, do flie for relieſe to Extraordinary calling; for thus writeth Caluin: (i) *Quia Papæ Tyrannide, &c.* Because through the Tyranny of the Pope, the true Ordinary Succeſſion of Ordination was broken of; therefore we ſtood in need of a new helpe, and this was the extraordinary guift. And D. Fulk thus writeth hereof: (k) *The Protestants, that firſt preached in theſe laſt dayes, had Extraordinary Calling.*

(i) Lascius a Protestant in his booke *de Russorū relig. c. 23* alledgeth Caluin thus saying: and see Caluin *lib. Institut. 4. c. 3. sect. 4.*

(k) Fulke agaynſt Staplerō. and Martiall pag. 2.

Therefore I will ſhow, that this poore refuge is impugned euen by the Protestants themſelues; ſo dāgerous an inciſion their own pens haue made in the wounds of their owne Church: for firſt D. Bilſon thus teacheth: (l) *They can haue no part of Apoſtolicall Commiſſion, who haue no ſhew of Apoſtolicall ſucceſſion. Againe, extraordinary Calling is euer warranted with working of Mira-*

(l) D. Bilſon in his perpetuall gouernmēt of the Church. c. 9. page 111.

Miracles, (as it was in the Apostles tymes) euen by the doctrine of the Protestants; for thus doth *Luther* expostulate others of their *Calling*, (and might not one by retortion expostulate *Luther* in his owne words) (m) *Vnde venis? quis te misit? Vbi sunt miracula quæ te à Deo missum esse testantur?* And yet it is most certayne, that *God* hath neuer honoured any one Protestãt so much since the first appearing of Protestancy, as to exhibite any one true and stupendious *Miracle* for confirmation of Protestancy. A point so vndenyable, that *D. Fulk* thus acknowledgeth; (n) *It is known, that Caluin and the rest, whome Papists call Arch-Heretikes, worke no miracles.*

(m) Luth. tom. 5. lat. Germ. fol. 67.

(n) Against the Rhemish Testam. in Apocalip. 13.

Thus farre of this poynt. Now to encircle the contents of all this Chapter within a narrow cõpasse, I thus dispute, If the Protestant Church

Church hath had no true *Personall Succession*, and *Ordinary vocation of Ministers*, then hath it not had any true *Pastours*, the euer watching Centinels of Gods Church, as (o) *Isay* stileth them; if it hath not had true *Pastours*, then hath it not enioyed the true *Administration of the word and Sacraments*; if it hath not enioyed the true *Administration of the word and Sacraments*, then hath it lost its *Essence*, and is thereby become a *Nullity* (as *D. VVillet*, and other Protestants in expresse words aboue cyted, doe auer) but if the Protestant Church hath by this meanes wāted its owne Essence, and became a *Nullity*; then euen ὁμολογουμένως, and *demonstratiuely* it followeth, that *Protestancy* (which is the supposed faith, preached by the Protestant Church, & believed by her children) hath in it

(o) Isa. 62.

selfe

selfe no *Essence* or being, but is
meere *Nullity*, or *Non Ens*.

The Non-Entity of Protestancy, prued from that, which it worketh in the VVills of its Professours.

CHAP. XIV.

ABoue we haue discouered, that *Protestancy* is depriued of all reality of being: both in regard that its whole *Systema* or frame consisteth of meere *Negations*, (which are nothing els, but an ouerthrowe of *Positiue* Articles of faith) as also (besides from seueral other heads) in that diuers particuler *Negatiue Tenets* of their profession, are, if they be truely vnfoulded, foud to be only vaporous imaginations without all subsistéce or being. Now, we will demonstrate the like Irreality of Protestancy,

stancy, by taking into our consideration, what that Religion produceth in the beleuers thereof, in regard of the *Will*, & of *Morality* in conuersation & maners. Where first we are to note, that *Sinne* (I meane the deformity, which is in euery sinnefull act) is in its owne nature, *Non ens*, and therfore cannot proceed from God, *VVho* (a) *made only thinges, and all thinges*. The reason heerof is, in that *Sinne* being a deuiation, & erring from the rule of reason, and a priuatio of goodnes, hath (as (b) S. *Austin* & all learned men teach) no efficient, but a deficient cause, & consequently, is *Non-ens*. And therefore *Peter Martyr*, as aboue is layd (for authorities pertinent, may well be iterated) very fully discourseth of the nature of Sinne in these wordes: *An* (c) *euill thing* (& such

(a) Gen. 1. Iohn 1.

(b) De ciuit. Dei l. 12. c. 7.

(c) In Cõmon places in English. part. 1. cap. 17.

such is Sinne) *hath no efficient, but a deficient cause. If any will search out this efficient cause, it is euen like as he would see the Darknes with his eyes, or comprehend Silence with his eares, which being priuations, it is no need, that they should haue efficient causes.* Now, to apply this to our matter in hand. Heere I auouch, that diuers *Negatiue Articles* of protestancy doe of their owne nature incline mans Will to sinne, and all turpitude in manners: and therefore as those protestantical *Tenets* or *Beliefs* in the vnderstāding (being but *Negations*, or *Priuations* of the contrary positiue Articles of the Catholikes) are depriued of all *Entity* of *Being*; so also is that, which they produce and beget in the Will (I meane *Sinne* & wickednes in the beliuers of them) depriued of all *Entity* or *Being*, though

other;

otherwise most displeasing & hatefull in the sight of God. And so that Axiome of Philosophy may heere by allusion take place, *Ex nihilo, nihil fit*. That *Sinne* is the fruit and effect of protestancy, I will exemplify it in those few Articles ensuing, maintayned by the Protestants. And first; the Protestants *Denyall of Free-will* (we Catholikes houlding the *Affirmative* heereto) impelleth man most forcibly to the satisfying of his vnlawfull and voluptuous desires in all kindes of *Sinne*. For who is persuaded truly, that he hath not Free-will in his actions, but that he is forced to doe that he doth, why should he labour to scale the craggy tower of vertue, or auoyd the pleasing bayte of *Sinne*, seeing it is not in his power, through want of Free-will, to performe eyther,

ther? And vpon this ground it is that the Protestants teach, that (d) *the ten Commandements appertayne not vnto Christians*. (e) And that, *the law remaineth stil impossible to be kept through the weakenes of our flesh: neither doth God giue vs ability to keep it &c.* Now doth not this doctrine open the passage to the breach of all the *ten Commandements*, and this without controwle or condening the party so offending, since it is not in his power to doe otherwyse?

(d) Luther serm. de Moyse.

(e) D. Willet Synops. Papism pag. 304.

In like sort the Protestants doctrine of *Reprobation* (which is but the *Negatiue* to the Catholike doctrine of *Vniuersality of Grace*) much discourageth men frō vertue, and inuiteth them to vice; since that man, who is a reprobate let him labour neuer so much to please God with walking in a most

ver-

pertuous and paynefull lyfe, yet by
his doctrine certaine it is, that
he shall be damned.

Againe, the Protestants denyal
of *Purgatory*, maketh a man fro
making any restitution or satisfac
tion for wrongs done to a third
person; so it much emboldeneth
him to sinne, assuring himselfe by
this doctrine, that notwithstading
any enormous sinnes whatsoeuer
committed by him, he once dying
in a true fayth, there are no tem-
porall punishments reserued for
him after this lyfe.

I heere but briefly touch how
the Protestants by their defence of
their *Iustifying fayth* excluding
workes both from iustification &
merit, do speake and write most
falsely and vnworthily of good
workes. For doth not (f) *Illiricus*
his reduce all good workes to *Sin*

(f) *In præf. ad Rom.*

hould that good workes are, in respect
but of presence, necessary to salvation
(as some Protestants do hould) is a pa
pistical errour. Yea he further most
impiously enlargeth himselfe, say-
ing: (g) Good workes are not only not
necessary to salvation, but hurtfull to
it. And D. Whitakers speaking
particularly of Virginity, doth
thus disvalew it: (h) Virginity is not
simply good, but after a certayne man-
ner. And of fasting D. Willet thus
teacheth: (i) Neyther is God better
worshipped by eating, or not eating.
Thus farre to shew, that these for-
mer doctrines of the Protestants
animate mans will most forcibly
to all Sardanapalisme, and sensuali-
ty; and beget a certayne incurious
and negligent torpour & slowne
in the soule eyther for practising
vertue, or auoyding of sinne. Fo
who obserueth not, that the will

(g) Vide Art. colloq. Aldeburg. pag. 120. sect. 12.

(h) Contra Camp. rat. 8.

(i) Synops. pag. 241.

faster or slower moued to good or euil, by how much it is peyzed more heauily or lightly with the pullies or weights of the hope of a *future good*, or feare of a *future euill*?

But to proceed further. As these former *negatiue Theses* of Protestants do incline the will to all turpitude in mãners, & consequently worke in the will, that, which in its owne Nature is nothing but meerely *negatiue*; so vpon iust examination we shall finde, that the first broachers and inuentours of them were men of most flagitious and wicked conuersation; so sucking their owne venome out of their owne doctrine. For greater cõtracting of which poynt, I will insist in the foure *Cardinall* (as I may terme them) and primi Protestantes of this age; by whome we may well coniecture the like in o-

ther

ther more obscure Protestãs; for we read, that *If the eyle be wicked, then all the body shalbe darke.* Now in the displaying hereof I will forbeare all testimonies of Catholikes against thẽ (since they would be presumed as I owre partialities in their Censures) but will rest eyther in their owne writings, or confessions of their learned Protestãs, their acknowledged brethrẽ of the Gospell. These foure chiefe Protestants shall be *Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin,* & *Beza*; men, who (above all others) have in most spread and dilated this *organized faith* of Protestancy; & in whome (concerning morality) you shall find little of the Gospell, though they vanted much of their professing the Gospell.

Matth. 5. 5.

(k) Luth. com. 1. propè finem

And first to begin with *Luther*. Touching faith, *Luther* thus teacheth. (k) *Faith confessed to be without*

the least good workes, doth not iustify, it is not faith. Which very saying D. Couel acknowledgeth as spoken by Luther, & rearmeth it. Harsh & (l) iustly called in question by the Church of Rome. Cõcerning mariage or diuorce, Luther thus writeth; Si (m) nolit uxor, aut non possit, veniat ancilla. If the wife will not, or cannot (perform the act of mariage) let the mayd come. And as touching Luthers owne licentious and goatish conuersation in manners, & want of chastity, heare his owne wordes deliuered of himselfe: Nothing (n) is more sweet, or louing vpon earth, then is the loue of a woman: if a man can obtayn it. And againe: As (o) it is not in my power, that I should be no man; so it is not in my power, I should be without a woman. And yet more: I (p) am burned with the great flame of my vntamed flesh &c. Eight dayes are now

(l) Dr. Cowel in his defence of Hooker printed 1603. pag. [illegible]

(m) Luther. serm. de Matrimo. This sentence as spoken by Luther is acknowledged by D. Whit. cont. Cap. 4. at. 8.

(n) Luth. in prouerb. 31. Addeth this amorous ryme in Dutch signifying as it is heer set downe in the text.

(o) Luth. tom 5. Wittenb. serm de Matrim. fol. 119.

(p) Luther

now past, wherin I neyther did wryte, pray, nor study; being vexed partly with temptations of the flesh, partly with other trouble. And finally: (q) I am almost madd through the rage of lust, and desire of women. But I will cease to stirre further in this filthy puddle of *Luthers* sensuality & lust and will end with him in setting down the saying of *Benedictus Morgensternensis* (a Protestant Writer) who reports of the Caluinists, that when they at any tyme would giue assent to prouocation of Nature & satisfy their lust; they were not (r) asshamed to say amog themselues: *Hodie (r) Lutheranice viuemus*. *To day we will liue Lutheran-like*. Thus they vsing the name of *Luther* (as a *Motto*) the more fully to expresse the sensuall deportment of *Luther*.

(p) Epist. Lutheri, fol. 334. & Philippum. (q) Luther in Colloq. Mensal. fol. 500. & vide fol. 400.

(r) Hunn. de Eccles. p. 224.

To come in this next place to *Swinglius* the second Arch of the Pro-

Protestãt Church, in her first erecting in the dayes of *Luther*. First touching his doctrine concerning good workes & a vertuous life, for the more depressing and vnderualewing therof, *Swinglius* teacheth, that the promises of eternall lyfe made to thẽ in Scripture, are only (l) *Hyperbolical*, or trãscending the truth. Touching God being the *Authour of sin*, Swinglius thus writeth (m) *That, the theefe is enforced to sinne*: That (n) *God mooueth the Theefe to kill*: (o) *That, the Theefe killeth, God procuring him*: That, (p) *Dauids adultery pertayned to God, as Authour*. Finally, that (q) *sinning agaynst the law, we are not Authours, but Gods Instruments*. A point so euident, & confessed, that (r) *Graserus* (Rector of the Protestant Vniuersity of *Islebium*) cõdemneth *Swinglius* of this most blasphemous doctrine

(l) Swinglius tom. 2. printed Tigur. de prouidentia Dei fol. 187.
(m) Swinglius tom. 2. de prouidentia fol. 366.
(n) Swinglius vbi supra.
(o) Swinglius vbi supra.
(p) Swinglius vbi supra fol. 365.
(q) Vbi supra fol. 366
(r) In his *Absurda absurdorum* &c. printed 1606. cap. 5. de praedest. fol. 3. 4.

ne, of God being the Author of him.

Now to come to Swinglius his deportment and cariage in manners. (b) Swinglius with some other Ministers in Switzerland (when they then liued) maketh supplication to that State, that they may be suffered to marry & take wyues, in these wordes following: (c) We earnestly request, that the vse of Mariage be not denyed vs, who feeling the infirmity of the flesh, desire, that the gift of Chastity may be giuen vs of God. Et si libidinis ęstum in nobis fervere negare non possumus cum huius vsus operam nos corā ecclesiis infames reddiderit. We cannot deny but the heate of lust boyleth in vs, in such sort that our want in that kind hath made vs infamous among the Professours of our owne Churches. And further: (d) We desire to marry, least the Soules committed to our charge (dum

(b) The title of Swinglius & other eyght Ministers supplication for wyues is this: Pietate & prudentia insigni Helvetiorum Reipublicæ Huldrichus Zuinglius, cæterique Verbi Dei apud Tigurinos Ministri, ad Senatum populumque Tigurinum.

(c) Vehementer petimus, ut matrimonii usus non denegetur nobis, qui infirmitatem carnis sentientes, petimus, ut castitatis donum nobis a Deo detur.

(d) Cupimus matrimonium contrahere, ne animæ nobis commissæ

tius

ing offendatur) should be any longer offended. And yet morb (e) We haue proued, that the weakenes of our flesh hath been the cause (proh dolor!) Q. for griefe! of our often falling. And fu- (f) Vbi sup. pra fol. 119 neatly. (Some haue burned (pro pudor!) Q. for shame! that we haue committed many things vnseemely. By this heer set downe, the Reader may take a search of Swinglius (who was the chiefe of these supplicating Ministers for wiues) and how he was wholy deuoted to lust & sen- suality.

In this next place occurreth Caluin (from whose pen Protestan- cy receaued a more pure sublima- tion.) Touching Caluins lyfe: that he was truly accused and pu- nished for Sodomy; & his shoul- der seared with a burning iron for that sinne, is witnessed by the pu- blike records of Noyon in France ex-

tant to this day, where he was pu-
nished; and also by (g) *Conradus Kluſſelburg* (the Protestant) which
sayd Protestant relateth the man-
ner of *Caluins* death in these words:
(h) *Deus manu ſua potenti &c.* God
ſo strucke Caluin with his mighty hād,
that being in deſpayre, and calling v-
pon the Diuell, he gaue vp his wicked
ſoule, ſwearing, cursing, and blaſphe-
ming: he dyed of the diſeaſe of lice &
wormes, increaſing in a moſt loathſome
vlcer, about his priuy parts, ſo as
none could endure the ſtench.

Thus this forsaid Protestāt wry-
teth. This manner of *Caluins* death
is further witnessed by (i) *Ioannes*
Herēnius (a Caluinist Minister) who
was present at Caluins death.

Now in this last place to de-
cend to *Beza*; who in teaching
God to be the *Authour* of Sinne,
wholy comparted with *Swinglius*;

for

(g) In Theatro Caluinist. printed 1594. lib. 2. fol. 72.
(h) Kluſſelburg. vbi ſupra.
(i) Herennius in hus lib. de vita Calu.

or thus he wryteth: (k) *God excu-*
eth the wicked will of one Theefe to
kill another; guideth his hand and
weapon, lastly enforcing the will of the
Theefe. But to leaue many of his o-
ther confessed erroneous doctri-
nes, and to rippe a little into his
course of life; I will only rest vpon
one poynt (and heere I may say
with the Poet, *ex vno discite omnes*)
to wit, his *Sodomiticall* sinne with a
yong boy called *Andabertus*, and his
fornicatiō with his woman *Candi-*
da, whome he kept diuers yeares as
* Concubine, before he maryed
her: who comparing the one Sin
with the other in certayne verses,
at last preferred the sinne with his
Ganymede the boy, before his sinne
with *Candida*. His verses I will heer
set downe in latin, though for
very shame I forbeare to English
them. These then they are.

(k) Beza in his display of popish practises poengliшed and prin. 1578. pa. 202.

* so saith *Conradus* Slusselb. *in Theolog. Calumniat. lib. 1. fol. 92.*

Abest

Abest Candida Beza quid moraris?
Andebertus abest, quid hic moraris?
Tenent Parisij tuos amores,
Habent Aurelij tuos lepores.
Et tu Veselijs manere pergis?
Procul Candidula, amoribusque:
Immo Veselij procul valete,
Et vale Pater, & valete fratres;
Nam Veselijs carere possum,
Et carere parente, & his & illis;
At non Candidula, Andebertoq; &c.

Then followeth

Sed vtrum, rogo, præferam duorum?
Verum inuisere me decet priorem?
An quenquam tibi Candida anteponã?
An quenquam tibi præferã Andeberte?
Quid si me in geminas secẽ ipse partes,
Harum vt altera Candidam reuisat,
Currat altera versus Andebertum?
At est Candida sic auara, noui,
Vt totum cupiat tenere Bezam,
Sic Bezæ est cupidus sui Andebertus,
Beza vt gestiat integro potiri,

Am-

Amplector quoque hic hunc, & illam,
Totus cupiam videre utrumq;,
Integris frui integer duobus.

Then he thus concludeth.

Preferre attamen alterum necesse est.
Duram nimium necessitatem!
Sed postquam tamē alterum necesse est,
Primores tibi defero Andeberte;
Quod si candida forte conqueratur,
Quid tum? basiolo tacebit uno.

This Epigram is extant in Beza his Epigrams, and beareth this title; Theodorus Beza de sua in Candidam & Andebertum benevolentia. That Beza did write this Epigram, is averred by the former Lusselburge, the famous Protestant, who thus writeth thereof (l) Constat & hoc, Bezam obsoletissimos versus scripsisse ad Germanum Andebertum Aurelia electum, & eundem tanquam Adonidem Bezæ factum esse. As also by Hemmingius the Protestant (m) saying thus

(l) Sleid. in Theolog. Callistus. lib. 1. fol.

(m) Tilmannus Hemingius in his booke entituled Vera & sane Confessionis.

Beza

Beza nefandos amores, illicitos concubitus, scortationes, fœda adulteria sacrilego carmine decantauit orbi. As also by (n) *M. Sparkes*, (o) *D. Sutcliffe*, and (p) *D. Morton*; though but weakly excused by these three last.

(n) *D. Sparks* in his answere to *D. Albin* printed 1591. pa. 400.

(o) *D. Sutcliff in Turco-papismo* printed 1599. lib. 3. cap. 10. pag. 204.

(p) *D. Morton* in his Apolog. Cathol. part. 1. lib. 2. cap. 21. pag. 355.

And thus farre of these foure chiefe Pillars of Protestancy: of whome I acknowledge, that I haue not set downe the tenth part, of what is confessed (euen by other Protestants) of their sensuality, and most wicked carriage. Notwithstāding what is heer set down, I hope it is not impertinently alledged, considering how highly most Protestants of these dayes do prise (through a forestalled preiudice of iudgment) the sayd foure chiefe broachers of the Protestāt Religion. And therefore though the iudicious Reader may perhaps

ensure part of this Chapter, as
n *Apostrophe*, or digression; yet
e may withal well esteeme it (the
ymes wherein we liue considered)
s a conducing, & progressiue di-
gression.

The Non-entity of Protestancy proued from that our Aduersaries cannot agree, what doctrines be Protestancy; & what Professours or sorts of men be members of the Protestant Church.

CHAP. XV.

ANother *Medium* which affordeth sufficient proofe for the Irrealitie of Protestancy, may be taken from this ensuing consideration: to wit, in that the Protestants amongst themselues are not resolued, what doctrines necessarily

ceſſarily concurre to the making vp of Proteſtancy, or of what in ueralll ſorts of Beleuers the Proteſtant Church conſiſteth. Now if the *Obiectum, circa quod*, or *Materia, circa quam* (as the Logicians ſpeake) of any ſcience or knowledge, be not agreed vpon before hand, what in particuler it is: the doubtleſſy it from thence riſeth, that ſuch a preſumed Science or Knowledge is but an Imaginary knowledge, wholy depriued of all *Reality* and *Entity*. For not onely Philoſophy, but euen the force of Naturall reaſon teacheth vs, that of all things, the *ſubiect*, or *matter* in euery Science or kind of knowledge, is firſt to be enquired after, and with a mutuall conſent on all ſydes to be acknowledged. The lyke we may confidently aſſume of Proteſtancy, and the Proteſtant

testant Church. That our aduer-
saryes cannot be brought to any
atonement, touching what is the
subiect of Protestancy; or who be
the *Members* of the Protestant
Church, is proued; in that seuerall
Protestants exclude such persons
to be of the Protestant Church;
(& consequently do exclude their
fayth from Protestancy) which
themselues at other tymes (at least
other Protestants) doe imbrace
for good protestants and perfect
mẽbers of their Church, and their
fayth & doctrine for perfect pro-
testancy. For such men, who are
admitted, or excluded from the
Church of the Protestants, are ad-
mitted or excluded only by reason
of their fayth and doctrine, being
the same, or different from the
Protestants fayth and doctrine.
Heere then I will first shew

within what narrow limits our aduersaries confine Protestancy, and the members of the Protestant Church; and then after I will set downe (such is the fluctuating and wauering iudgmẽt of our aduersaries herein) how they are content at other tymes to extend and enlarge those bounds, by affording Protestancy, and the members therof a greater space or compasse, as I may say, to expatiate, and walke in.

Papists reiected.

And to begin. We first fynd, that the poore *Papist* is wholy exterminated from this holy Society of Protestants: in proofe whereof to be luxuriant in authorityes, were but loft labour, it being a thing so well knowne and generally confessed: therefore the testimony only of *D. VVhitakers* shall serue, who thus writeth: (a) I

(a) D. Whitak. lib. contra Durœum. 2. sect. 2.

will

will not allow the very name of a lawful Church, vnto the Romane Church, because it hath nothing, which a true Church ought to haue.

To proceed. The Protestants exile the *Anabaptists* out of their Church, as being no members thereof; nor their doctrine, Protestancy. This is euident out of the Confession of *Ausburg*, thus teaching: (b) *VVe condemne the Anabaptists who disallow the baptisme of Infants, and thinke them to be saued without Baptisme.* To which Confession, the Confession of *Switzerland* in these like wordes subscribeth: (c) *VVe condemne Anabaptists, who deny Infants to be baptized.* In like manner they exclude from their fayth and Religion, the doctrine of the *Arians*, according to the Confession of *Ausburg* in this poynt, saying:

Anabaptists.

(b) Cap. 9.

(c) Cap. 20.

Arians.

(d) Art. 1. (d) *VVe condemne all Hereſies, riſing agaynſt this Article* (meaning the Article of the *Trinity*) *as the Manichees, Arians, Eunonians &c.*

Heretiks. To come to *Heretikes* in generall; they alſo by reaſon of their particuler Hereſyes, houlden ſeuerally by them, are exempted out of the members of the Proteſtants Church, and this euen by the iudgement of the *Sacramentaries*, and the *Lutheranes*: And firſt touching the iudgement of the *Sacramentaries* paſſed on this poynt.

We find the *Confeſsion of Baſill*, thus to teach: (e) *VVe dryue away all, whoſoeuer diſſenting from the ſociety of the Holy Church, doe either bring in, or follow ſtrange and wicked doctrines.* And Caluin in lyke manner ſayth: (f)

(e) Art. 24

(f) Inſtit. l. 2. cap. 15. num. 1.

Austin denyeth Heretikes to haue the same foundation with the godly, albeit they preach the name of Christ.

D. Sucliffe: (g) *Heretykes are not of the Church.* Finally D. *VVhite:* (h) *All Heretikes teach the truth in somethinges; yet we deny them to be of the Church of God.*

(g) In his first booke of the Church. cap. 1.

(h) In his way to the Church pag. 10.

The same doctrine is fully maintayned by the *Lutherans*. For thus teach the *Centuristes*: (i) *Neyther Heretykes, nor deuysers of fanaticall opinions are of Christ; but they are of Antichrist, and of the Diuell.* &c.

(i) Cent. 6. in the præface.

VVhich point is also fully taught by *Luther* himselfe, in these wordes: (k) *Neither Gentill, Iew, Heretyke, or any sinner is saued, vnles he make atonement with the Church, and in all things thinke, do, and teach the same.* But the Protestants rest not heerewith, but also doe banish

(k) Luth. in his explication of the Creede.

Schismatikes.

Schiſmatikes frō the Church. And to begin with the *Lutherans*, *Melanchthon* his iudgement heerein is this: (l) *Neither is there more then one Church, the ſpouſe of Chriſt; neyther doth this compamy conſiſt of diuers ſects.* Which doctrine he borrowed from *Luther* thus writing: (m) *I believe, that there is on earth a litle Cō-gregation of Saintes, agreeing in all things, without ſects, or Schiſmes.*

(l) In his booke againſt Suenkfeld tom. 2. p. 301.

(m) Luth. in his great Catechiſm. tom. 5. p. 628.

To come to the *Sacramentaries* herein. *Caluins* wordes are theſe: (n) *VVe do profeſſe the vnity of the Church (ſuch as is deſcribed by S. Paul) to be moſt deare vnto vs: and we accurſe all them, that ſhal any way violate it.* *D. Field*: (o) *The name of the Catholike Church* (he meaning his owne Proteſtant Church) *is applyed to diſtinguiſh men, houlding the fayth in vnity, from Schiſmatikes.* *D. VVhitaker*: (p) *It is falſe, that*

(n) Caluin in his Treatiſe of the neceſſity of reforming the Church.

(o) Of the Church. 2. cap. 7.

(p) Controuerſ. 2. q. 3. cap. 9.

Hereti-

Hereticall and Schismaticall Churches are true Churches. Finally to omit infinit others for breuity, D. Fulk thus discourseth: (q) *What skilleth it, whether one (being drawne by Heresy or Schisme frō the body of Christ) be subiect to eternall damnation?*

(q) D. Fulke of the Succession of the Church.

Thus farre to shew how our Aduersaries do coarct and straiten (and in some sense rightly) the true fayth and Church of God; & consequently in their iudgments, their owne Protestant fayth and Church; seeing they admit not in these former testimonies, any other fayth and Church to be true, but onely Protestancy, and their Protestant Church.

Now, in this next place shall appeare the wonderfull *Proteanlike* mutability of the Protestants (who are only constant in Inconstancy) in crossing their former

Iudgements, by affording a farre greater *Circumference* to the Professours of Protestancy & to their Church, then in the former passage they haue done; so true it is, that Innouatours are caryed *spiritu vertiginis*, now affirming one thing, presently after (and al with one breath) recalling and contradicting the poynts afore affirmed or maintayned.

For now you shall finde, that the Protestants most courteously grant, that almost all the former kinds of men (and some others more bad) are members of the Protestant Church; and consequently their doctrines true Protestancy; since a man is stiled a member of a Church, in regard that his faith and doctrine is consonant and sorting to the fayth & doctrine of the sayd Church, and

not

not in any other respect.

And to begin. The Protestants (out of their bounty) include the *Papists*, as mẽbers of their Church: for thus doth *Luther* say: (r) *In the Papery there is true Christianity, yea the kernell of Christianity, and many pious, and great Saints*. And the Confession of *Ausburg*, confesse thus of themselues, & the Papists: (s) *We are all Souldiers vnder one Christ*.

Papists admitted

(r) *Luther, in epist. cont. Anabaptist.*

(s) *In præfat.*

To descend to others confessing no lesse: His *Maiesty* deceased thus speaketh of this poynt: (t) *We doe iustly confesse, that Papists, especially our forefathers, laying their only trust vpon Christ, and his merits, may be, and are sometymes saued*. And M. *Hooker* thus acknowledgeth the *Papists* for his brethren: (u) *We gladly acknowledge them of Rome to be of the family of* IESVS *Christ*.

(t) In his speach to the Parlamẽt. An. 1605 Nouem. 9. being, put forth in print.

(u) *Lib. Eccles. pol. 3. c. 1. §. 8.*

M. *Bunny*: (x) *VVe are no seuerall Church from them* (meaning the *Papists*) *nor they from vs*. And the foresayd M. *Hooker* particulerly touching the fayth of the Papists, thus further pronounceth: (y) *Touching the maine poynts of Christian fayth, wherein they constantly persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Iesus Christ*. D. *VVhitgift*: (z) *The Papists believe the same Articles of fayth, which we do*. For breuity D. *VVhite* shall conclude this poynt, saying: (a) *In the substantiall Articles of fayth we agree with the Papists*. Now by these Testimonies and confessions we see (most differently from their former writings) that *Papists* are members of the true Church, and consequently (in our aduersaries censure) of the Protestant Church: and that the articles of *Papistry*, are but the fayth

(x) In his Treatise of Pacific. sect. 88.

(y) *Eccles. Pol. p.* 128

(z) In his Answere to the Admonition p. 40

(a) In defence of the way. cap. 38.

ayth and doctrine of protestancy.

In the next place (according to the Methode aboue) come in the *Anabaptists*, whom the Protestãts admit to be of their Church, and their doctrine no way preiudiciall to their owne doctrine of Protestancy. For first of this point *Oecolampadius* thus writeth: (b) *Baptisme is an externall thing, which by the law of Charity may be dispenced withall.* And (c) *Whitakers* iudgment is, *that we may abstaine from Baptisme, so there be no contempt or scandall following.*

Anabaptists.

(b) Lib. 2. Epist. pag. 363.

(c) Controu. 4 9. cap. 2. p. 716.

Finally, *D. Morton* thus brotherly acknowledgeth the *Anabaptists*: (d) *We Protestants iudge the state of the Anabaptists, not to be vtterly desperate.* Touching the *Arians*, M. *Hooker* telleth vs in these wordes: (e) *The Arians in the reformed Churches of Poland &c.*

(d) In his Answere to the Protestãts Apology. lib. 4. ca. 2. sect. 10

(e) Eccles. Pol. lib. 4. pag. 181.

he

Arians.

he heerby insinuating, that those Protestant Churches in Poland did acknowledge the *Arians*, as mẽbers of their Church: though I fully presume, that *M. Hooker* himselfe was of a far different opinion. And M. *Morton* peremptorily maintaineth, that his protestant Church is one, and the same with the Church of the *Arians*, and giueth his reason thereof in these words, (f) *Because the Arias hold the foundation of the Gospell.*

(f) In his booke of the Kingdome of Israel, & the Church. pag. 94.

They further proceede, & incorporate within the protestant Church euen *Idolaters*. For M. *Hooker* thus affirmeth: (g) *Christians by externall profession they are all, whose marke of recognizance hath in it those thinges, which we haue mentioned; yea although they be impious Idolaters, wicked Heretykes, persons excommunicable.*

Idolaters

(g) Eccles. Polic. l. 3. pag. 126.

And

And this poynt receaueth its further proofe from the Protestãts comportement toward the Catholikes. For we well know, that the Protestants at other tymes both by writing and in their Sermons, with moſt tragicall Exclamations charge the Catholikes with *Idolatry* cõmitted in their adoring our Sauiour *Christ* in the moſt bleſſed *Euchariſt*, and in their worſhip exbited to Images and Relikes. And yet aboue we ſee, the Protestants teach, that the Protestant and Catholike Church are but one, & the ſame Church. Now if the *Papiſts* be members of the Protestant Church, & that they be *Idolaters*, (as the protestãts do dreame) thé are *Idolaters* members of the protestant Church.

But the protestant doth not limit his Church with in theſe former

mer Cancells or bounds; for he also comparteth and interleageth euen with the *Infidels*, admitting them to be members of his owne Church, & teaching that they be capable of saluation. For (b) *M. Fox* relateth of a protestãt Martyr (by him for learning and vertue much magnified) who thus taught *A Turke, Saracene, or any Mahometan whatsoeuer may be saued, if he trust in one God, and keep his law.* And (i) *Bale* warnes vs to be wary, that we condemne not rashly any Turke. But this poynt is further most amply taught by *Swinglius* and other Protestãt deuines, as aboue in the sixt chapter of this Treatise, is manifested; to which passage for greater expedition, I referre the studious Reader.

Infidels.

(b) *Act. Mon. pag. 495.*

(i) *Bale Cent. 6. p. 404.*

But what? hath protestãcy yet receaued its due *circumscription*, as

I may say, and confinement? No: for the Protestants charity is so great and immense, as that they are content to admit and indenize euen him, whome they mantaine (by their own writings) to be the true *Antichrist*, for a member of the Protestant Church. O most strange Church, cōsisting of such *Heterogeneous* members! That this is so, I thus prooue: The Protestants (I meane the greatest part of them) confidently teach, that the Pope is the true *Antichrist*, deciphered in the holy Scripture. Now marke, what Protestants neuertheles confesse in this poynt. D. *Whitakers* thus writeth: (k) *I will not say, that from the tyme, that Papistry began to be Antichristianity the Popes themselues haue beene all dāned.* And yet the sayd *D. Whitakers* elswhere (l) auerreth most cō-

Antichrist

(k) D. *Whit.* in his Answere to the first demonstration. of *D.* Sāders.

(l) D. Whit. in his answere to the last demonstration. of D. Sāders.

fi-

fidently, the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*. I will adioyne heerto the like charitable censure of *M. Powell*: who taught the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*, and yet thus writeth: (m) *I will in no wise say, that all the Popes from the tyme wherein Papistry was first reuealed to be Antichristianity, are damned.* Thus far of what persons are truly acknowledged by the iudgement of the Protestants for members of their owne Church. But *Musculus*, the Protestant, is more lauish herein, and proceedeth yet one step further, by enlarging the Protestant Church; his wordes are these: (n) *I imbrace all for brethren in the Lord, howsoeuer they disagree frō me, or amongst themselues; as long as they mantayne not the Popish Impiety.* O most Serpentine and diuelish rancour and malice! Thus far of this subiect in generall. But now

(m) M. Powel de Antichristo cap. 33. p. 338.

(n) Musculus in loco com. de ecclesia p. 352.

to

to reflect vpon the premiſes, and to draw from thence an vnauoydable deduction.

If ſo then on the one ſyde, euery Fayth, Religion, and Church are to haue knowne & explayned (as their chiefe and firſt *Theoreme*) what doctrines concurre to the making vp of the ſame fayth and Religion, and what kind of men are the mebers of the ſaid Church; and if this be not firſt known, that then it followeth, that ſuch a faith or Church is but meerely Intentionall: and Irreall. And if on the other part, Proteſtancy, and the Proteſtant Church be ſo irreſolute, deluded and diſtracted in iudgment (a neceſſary Attendant of Errour and falſhood) that at one tyme, they will wholy extermi-nate from their fayth and Church the *Papiſts*, the *Anabaptiſts*, the

Arians, *Heretikes* in generall, and *Schismatikes*; and at another tyme (or perhaps at the same time, & by the same Protestants) wil incorporate and admit into the fellowship of their Religion and Church, not only the sayd *Papists*, *Anabaptists*, *Arians*, *Heretikes*, & *Schismatikes*, but also supposed *Idolaters*, *Infidels*, *Antichrist*, and euery one, who in any sort impugne the Church of Rome; if all this I say be true (as is prooued to be in this Chapter) what other inferece can be made, but that Protestancy and the Protestant Church (for want of knowing and acknowledging what doctrines are Protestancy, and what sorts of men are Protestants) are in themselues but meer empty & aëry conceyts; and for want of all true and reall subsistence, but a

The Non-Entity of Protestancy demonstrated, from that, euery Protestant eyther in himselfe, or in his Predecessours, originally departed, and came out, from the Roman Catholike Church.

CHAP. XVI.

AN other *Medium*, to proue that protestancy is a meer Irreality, or *Non-Entity*, may be this. Yf it can be proued, that Protestancy is more late, & yong then the Catholike Religion is; then followeth it, that Protestancy cannot haue any true, and reall *Subsistence*. For if our Catholike, & Roman Religion had a being before protestancy; and that protestancy did appeare long after, and consisteth only in the denyall of most of the Articles of the Catholike Religion; then followeth it

vnauoydably, that Protestancy is but an imaginary Conceyte, or Fabricke of the imagination without any foundation of Being: for seing the Catholike Fayth, & the Protestant Faith are directly contradictory & oppositly repugnāt, both of them cannot enioy a reall *Being*: for if they could, the meer *Contradictories* (& this is denyed, that it can be performed euen by Gods power) should enioy a true and Reall *Being* togeather.

Now that Protestancy is more late, or of a newer date, then the Roman Religion, I thus proue: There cannot any one protestāt be alledged (speaking of such Protestants, as are out of Cōtrouersy, and acknowledged for such both by Protestant and Catholike) who was not eyther in himself, or in his Forefathers, first a Catholike; & who

who by dogmatizing some Protestant Opinions afore neuer generally taught, did separate himselfe & depart from the Cath. Church then afore in *Being*. Of which sort of men these wordes in S. *Iohn* are vnderstood, *Exierũt ex nobis. 1. Ioan.* 2. The very stampe or signature of Innouatours in doctrine.

Let vs exemplify this in the first and chiefest Protestants. I will begin with *Ochinus* & so ascend higher. This *Ochinus* (who was a chiefe mã in disseminating of Protestancy in England in King *Edwards* dayes) was first a (a) *Monke*, and forsaking his Monastical life, began to preach Protestancy. (b) *Bucer* was at the first also a *Mõke*, & vpon his reading of *Luthers* booke of *Vowes*, forsooke his Monastery & married a womã. *Zwinglius* * was first a *Catholike Priest*, & publike

(a) So saith Sleidan l. 9. at anno 1547. fol. 297.

(b) *Ofiander Cent. 16. l. 1. c. 33.*

* So saith Hospiniã in hystor. Sacram. fol. 22.

Preacher at *Tigure* in Switzerlād. *Luther* was a *Priest*, & an (c) *Austin Friar*; & vpō his first reuolt from the Papacy, tooke to wife *Catherine Bore*, as the whole world knoweth.

(c) In his Epist. to his Father extat tom. 2. Wittēberg. printed 1562. fol. 269.

Now that there was no other Church in *Being* before *Luthers* Apostacy, then the Roman Catholike Church, appeareth from the liberal acknowledgmēt of the learned Protestāts. For *M. Perkins* thus writes: (d) *We say, that before the dayes of Luther, for the space of many hundred yeares, an Vniuersall Apostasy so ouerspread the face of the Church, that is was not then visible to the world.* And Doctour *Iewell*, confesseth no lesse, saying: (e) *The truth was vnknowne at that tyme, & vnheard of, when Martin Luther & Huldericke Zwinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the Gospell.* Yea *Luther* himself euen *Thra-*

(d) In his Expositiō vpon the Creed. p. 400.

(e) In his Apologie of the Church. part. 4. c. 34.

soni-

ſonically conteſteth this poynt in theſe his words: (f) *Chriſtum à nobis primò vulgatum audemus gloriari*: ſo cleare it is, that *Luther* was originally a Catholike, and that at his firſt riſing there was no Proteſtant Church in the world. But to proceed further. *Huſſe* was a *Catholike Prieſt* before his reuolt, and wholy till that tyme imbraced the Catholike Fayth, as (g) *Luther* and (h) M. *Fox* do teſtify. *Ierome of Prague* was firſt a *Catholike*, and after became an Heretike; who being at the Councell of *Conſtance*, renounced openly his hereſies; but after apoſtating the ſecond tyme, he loſt his lyfe. *VVicleff* was firſt a *Catholike Prieſt*, and *Parſon* of *Lutterworth* in *Liceſterſhyre*, and firſt abandoned his Religion, becauſe he was deprined of a Benefice by the Arch-biſhop of Canterbury,

(f) *Luther in epiſt. ad Argentinenſ. anno 1525.*

(g) *In Colloq. de Antichriſto.*

(h) *In Apocalip. c. 11. p. 290.*

(i) Stow recordeth.

(i) In his Annals of England printed 1591. pa. 425.

VValdo was a rich man of *Lyons* in France, and originally a *Catholike*, of whome *D. Humfrey* thus writeth: (k) *he did forsake all things, that being poore, he might better follow Christ, and the Euangelicall perfections.* The *VValdenſis* (who were deriued of *VValdo*, and thereupon ſo called) were an *Order of begging Fryars*, and did profeſſe (as the ſaid *D. Humfrey* writeth) (l) *a kind of Monaſticall lyfe.* And of the *VValdenſes* doctrine in particular *Caluin* thus writeth: (m) *The forme of the Confeſsion of the VValdenſes doth involue all thoſe in eternall damnation, who do not confeſſe, that the bread is truly become the body of Christ.* They alſo euer taught *ſeauen Sacraments, Vowes, ſingle lyfe, and Purgatory*, as (n) *Morgenſternenſis* (a Lutheran) writeth.

(k) Inieſuitiſm. part 2. rat. 3. pag. 270

(l) Vbi ſupra.

(m) Epiſt. 244.

(n) In tract. de Eccleſ. pag. 124.

The

The *Albigenses* were the same men with the *Waldenses*, and therefore were originally *Catholikes*, so thus *D. Abbots* writeth thereof: (o) *Thus Lyonists, or poore men of Lyons, and Waldenses, or Albigenses were the same men; but diuersly, and vpon diuers occasions tearmed by the Romish Synagogue.*

(o) In his second part of the defence. printed 1607. pag. 55.

Berengarius was *Archdeacon* of *Angiers* in France, and therefore it followeth, that he was *Catholike* till his denyall of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*: and yet after he abandoning his Heresy, dyed (p) *Catholyke*.

(p) As witnesseth Fox in Act. *Mon. pag.* 13.

Now to rise to higher tymes. The like may be sayd of the auncient Nouelists, broaching some poynts of Protestancy: As *Aerius* denying prayer for the dead; *Manicheus* freewill; *Iouinian*, teaching Virginity to be no better then ma-

riage; *Donatus*, denying the Visibility of the Church, and all others of those tymes without exception. From which men are descended the *Aerians*, *Manicheans*, *Iouinians &c.* taking their denomination from the former men, according to that, *Prout Hæresiarchæ Nomen, ita Secta vocatur.* All which men were *originally Catholikes*, and most of them *Priests*, and vpõ their broaching of these their particular opinions of Protestancy, did depart from their knowne common Mother, then in *Being*.

Chrysost. Hom. 3. in act. Apolog.

That these men, and all such others of those tymes, were *originally Catholykes*, and departed fro a more auncient Church, by forging these their Innouations, thus appeares: *First*, because euery one of them taught but one, or two points (for the most part) of Protestan-

teſtancy, belieuing al other points of fayth with the then Roman Catholik Church: for if they had maintained any other Poſitions of Proteſtancy, then thoſe with which they are charged at this day: then would *S. Auſtin*, *Epiphanius*, *Ierome*, and other orthodox all Fathers of thoſe tymes (all which Fathers, (q) *Luther*, and other (r) moſt eminent Proteſtants hould for abſolute and groſſe *Papiſts*, as they terme them) haue as well regiſtred their other ſuppoſed Articles of Proteſtancy for Hereſies, as well as they haue recorded theſe few, of which, all ſides confeſſe they ſtand rightly charged. But no ſuch Relation of any other points of Proteſtancy in the do we find in the Fathers writings, or otherwiſe recorded in any Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory of thoſe tymes. *Secondly*

(q) *Luth. lib. de ſerno arbitrio* printed *anno* 1558 *pag.* 454.

(r) The Archbiſhop of Canterbury in his defence of the Anſwere to the admonition pag. 472. 473. D. Hunfrey *in vita Iem. Ha* printed at London, pag. 212. D. Whitakers *contra Duraum lib.* 6. *p.* 413.

condly the same is euident, euen from the confessed *Inuisibility* of the Protestant Church in those dayes: and sortably heerto it is, that *Sebastianus Francus* (an eminent Protestant) thus writeth: (i) *For certayne, through the worke of Antichrist, the externall Church, together with the fayth and sacraments, vanished away presently after the Apostles departure; and that for these fourteene hundred yeares, the Church hath not beene externall, and visible.*

(i) In Ep. de abrogatis in vniuersū omnibus statutis Ecclesiast.

To whose iudgement agreeth *D. Fulke*, saying: (i) *The true Church decayed immediatly after the Apostles dayes.* Within which circuite of tyme of the Protestant Churches Inuisibility, *Aerius*, *Manicheus*, *Iouinian*, and the rest did liue Thus we see, that not any one Protestant before the reuolt of *Luther* can be instanced; but that it may be shewed,

(i) In his answere to a counterfaite Catholik pag. 15.

d, that the same man was primarily a *Catholike* eyther in himselfe, or in his Predecessours. But the case is farre otherwise with the Catholike Church: for it is confessed by our learned Protestants, that our Catholike Church neuer departed, or came out of any other more auncient Church afore it *Being*: A truth so vndeniable, that D. *Sutcliffe* confesseth so much (though sleighting the force therof) in these wordes: (u) *It is not materiall, that the Romanists neuer went out of any knowne Christian Society.* But M. *Bunny* dealeth more ingenuously and plainely heerin, who thus writeth, touching the departing of the Protestant Church from out the Catholike: (x) *It was well done of them, who first vrged such a separation; for that it is great probability for them* (meaning the Catho-

(u) In his answere to the supplication fol. 8

(x) In his pacification page 119. & p. 26.

Catholiks) *that so we make our sel*
answerable to find out a distinct & s
uerall Church from them, which ha
continued from the Apostles age
this present, or els must acknowledge
that our Church hath sprung vp
late, or since theirs: so fully this Pro
testant granteth, that the Roman
Church did neuer depart, or g
out from a more ancient Church
But now to wind vp the conte
of this Chapter in few wordes
thus I inferre. If on the one syde
it be proued, that euery Protestan
did originally come out, and de
part (by his venting of Prote
stanticall Positions) from our Ca
tholike Church, afore enioying
Priority of Being: and that on the
other side it be confessed, that our
Roman Church neuer departed
frō out any more ancient Church
afore in *Being* (both which points

are in this Chapter aboue proued) what other Inference then can be made, but that Protestancy (as being later in tyme, and meerely *contradictory* to our Catholicke fayth) wanteth all true *Entity* and *Subsistence*? for seeing the Catholike fayth (for many hundred of yeares confessedly) had its *being* afore; and seeing the Protestant Fayth is but a meere *Contradiction* of the Catholike fayth: the Protestant fayth therefore hath no *Reality of Being*, since *Contradictories* cannot subsist together, or enioy seuerall *Beings*. Thus farre of this poynt: where (besides, that the *Non-Entity* of Protestancy is from hence necessarily euicted) the Contents of this Chapter minister a must choaking demonstration, for the proofe of the Catholike Religion in generall; seeing

ing God is more ancient then the Diuell, and Truth then falshood.

That the Protestant denyes the Authorities of all those Affirmatiue, and Positiue Heads, from whence the Catholikes draw their proofes.

CHAP. XVII.

THough this Chapter doth not immediatly conduce to the prouing, that Protestancy is a *Non-Entity*: yet I hold it not altogether to be *Parergon*, or impertinent; since in it, it is layd open, how the *Protestant* still continewes the *Protestant*, that is, how he is wholy deuoted, and (as it were) become thrall to *Negations*: in diuers of the former passages it is shewed, that the Protestant in reference

ference to his fayth, resteth onely vpon *Negations*; Now heer it shall appeare, that whereas the Catholike drawes out his proofes in defece of his Religion (as so many great pieces of Artillery, to batter downe the walles of Noueliſme) from certaine *Affirmatiue* reall, & *Positiue* heads; the Protestant in lieu of withstanding these forces by dispute, is constrayned to retire himselfe to his accustomed sanctuary of *Negations*: so fugitiue and fleeting he is in answers; thus betrampling (with a bare *denying*) the weight & strength of all those *Affirmatiue* Classes; or kinds of proofes.

1. For example; if the Catholike insist in the Authority of *Miracles* (and so to descend by degrees to other Proofes) for defence of his Religion; in the patratio

wherof God for his approbatiō of the sayd Religion, euen disioineth the setled frame of Nature: The Protestants in answere heerto, *deny* the force of miracles, tearming thē, but (a) *Antichristian wonders, & lying signes*: and further saying, that they deny (b) *that any miracles were wrought, since the Apostles dayes.*

2. If the Catholike alledge diuers passages of *Scripture*, as out of *Toby*, the booke of *Wisedome*, *Ecclesiasticus*, the *Machabees*, &c. The Protestāts with full voyce & cry, *deny* these bookes to be (c) *Canonicall Scripture*, & stile them only *Apocryphall.*

3. If he alledge such parts of *Scripture*, which are acknowledged for Scripture, on all sydes; the Protestāt *denyes* the *Trāslation* of the said Scripture to be true and sincere; auerring, that it is adulterated & corrupted

(a) So the Centuristes call them. *Cent 4. col. 1445. & Cent. 5. Col. 1485.* And Osiander. *Cent. 10. 11. 12. &c.*

(b) So sayth D. Morton *in his Apolog Cathol part. 2 l. 2 c. 29.* and D. Succliffe in his Examinat. of the Survey of D. Kellison.

(c) This appeareth in that in the English Translations of

corrupted by false versions of it. This appeareth frō that, which is aboue deliuered, touching the Protestants reprehension both of the translations of Scripture made by forrayne Protestants, as also of our English Translations. But if the Protestants doe reiect their owne brethrens Translations, thē much lesse will they stād vnappealably to our Catholike Translations of the Scripture.

their Bibles, they vsually in the beginning of a leafe, containing the names of the bookes of Scripture, do call these bookes, and some other, Apocryphas.

4. If the Catholike proceed further in insisting in the *Originals* of both the Testaments. The Protestants *deny*, that the originalls of them are the same in all passages, as they were first penned by the Prophets, the Euangelists, and the Apostles. Thus for example in the new Testament, where in (d) S. *Matthew*, it is sayd, ὁ πρῶτος Πέτρος, *the first Peter*; (e) *Beza denyeth* the

(d) Matth. c. 10.

(e) Beza in his Annotat. vpon the new Testament, set foorth anno 1556.

Originall herin; iuſtifiing (though it be thus read in all Greeke copyes extant at this day) that the word πρῶτος, *primus*, was added by ſome one, enclining to the defence of the Popes Primacy. In like ſort (f) *Beza denyeth*, that the Greeke Originall in Luke 22. is at this preſent, the ſame as it was firſt penned by the Euangeliſt; maintayning that it is corrupted in fauour of the Reall preſence.

(f) Beza vbi ſupra.

(g) So doth D. Whitakers, de Eccleſ. contra Bellarm. controuerſ. 2. q. 4. p. 223. Perkins in his Expoſition of the Creed. p. 400. Iewell in his Apology of the Church of England part. 4. cap. 4. and moſt other Proteſtants.

5. If he inſiſt in ſuch paſſages of Scripture, whoſe *Originalls* and *Tranſlations* therin are on all parts accepted for true; and tell his Aduerſary, that the whole Church of God in her Primitiue, and purer tymes euer interpreted the ſaid paſſages of Scripture in that ſenſe, in which they are at this preſent by the Catholikes alledged; The Proteſtat abſolutly (g) *denyes* that infal-

infallible authority of the Church of God, in interpreting the holy Scripture but disclayming from it appeales to his owne *Priuate* spirit interpreting the same.

6. If forbearing the written word of God, he alledge in warranting of his fayth, the *vnwritten word of God*, I meane *Apostolicall Traditions*, the Protestant *denyes* peremptorily the Authority of all such *Traditions*. Thus for example, where S. *Chrysostome* sayth: (b) *The Apostles did not deliuer all things by writinge, but many thinges without, and these be as worthy of credit, as the other.* D. *Whitakers* reiects this authority touching *Traditions*, in these wordes: (i) *I answere, That this is an inconsiderate speach, and vnworthy so great a Father.* And *Cartwright* in depressing the weight of *Traditions* maintayned

(b) Chrysost in 2. Thessal. hom. 4.

(i) D. Whitak. de sacra Script. pars. pag. 678.

ned by S. *Augustine*, thus writeth:

(k) See Cartwright in whitgifts defence, p. 103.

(k) *To allow S. Austins saying, is to bring in Popery agayne*

7. If leauing the *word of God*, he descend to *humane authorities*, (yet so *humane*, as that they haue the peculiar promise of (l) *Christs* assistance therein,) I meane to the graue authority of *Generall Councells*: the Protestants *deny* all authority of them. For *D. Whitakers* openly professeth, that *Generall Councels* (m) *may and haue erred*. But *Peter Martyr* more fully dismasketh himselfe, in *denying* the authority of Generall Councells, for he thus plainely writeth: (n) *As long as we insist in Generall Councells, so long we shall continue in the Popish Errours.*

(l) Matt. 28.

(m) L. de Concil. contra Bellar. q. 6.

(n) Pet. Martyr. lib. de votis. pag. 476.

8. If he produce the Testimonies of *particuler Fathers* of the Primitiue Church: Marke with what con-

contempt and indignity the Protestant *denyes them*: for *Luther* thus depresseth them: (o) *The Fathers of so many ages haue beene plainely blind and most ignorant in the Scriptures; they haue erred all their lyfe tyme, & vnles they were amended before their deaths, they were neyther Saints, nor pertayning to the Church.* And another (though no *Lutherane*, yet of *Luthers* descent) in this his scurrilous Pasquill thus traduceth the Fathers: (p) *Ex Patrum erroribus ille Pontificia Religionis cento consequutus est. The Popish Religion is a patched cloath of the Fathers Errours sowed togeather*: see how impudent and petulant *Noueliſme* in fayth is, in expecting precedency, and taking the wall of Reuerend, & *hoary Antiquity*.

(o) Luth. de ſerno arbitrio, printed 1551. pag. 434.

(p) D. Wotak. contr contra Durenum. l. 6. pag. 413.

9. If in such poynts, which cõcerne *matter of fact*, as touching the

the ſuppoſed change of fayth in the *viſibility* of the Church, the *vocation* and *miſsion of Paſtours*, & the vninterrupted *Adminiſtration of the word and Sacraments*, all which are to receaue their proofe (or els not to be proued at all) fró the Authority of auncient & moſt authenticall *Hiſtories*; If (I ſay) the Catholike do in proofe heerof produce the auncient *Hiſtories* of thoſe Primitiue tymes, *D. Whitakers* thus by *denyall* aleniateth and leſſeneth the Authority of all Hiſtories; (q) *Sufficit nobis &c.* To *vs it is ſufficient by comparing the Popiſh opinions with the Scripture, to diſcouer the diſparity of fayth betweene them and vs: And as for Hiſtoriographers, we giue them liberty to write what they will.* And accordingly touching the Imaginary change of Rome in her fayth, he thus cō-

(q) D. D. Whitak. contra Duræum. l. 7. pag. 478.

cludeth:

cludeth: (r) *It is not needfull to vs, to search out in Histories the beginning of this change.* (r) Whitak. vbi supra. pag. 277.

10. To conclude, if in the last place for most demonstratiue and *Affirmatiue Notes & markes* of the true *Church*, the Catholike doth (as in *nube Testium*, to vse the Apostles phraise) in *vniuersality, visibility, vninterrupted continuance, vnity, Succession of Pastours, Holynes of doctrine, Conuersion of Kings and Nations, of the Gentils, &c.* The Protestants (besides, that they will not admit any *Histories* in proofe of them) *deny* and discarde the testimonies of all these *Positiue* Heads of proofes, by erecting the *Preaching of the word, and Administration of the Sacraments*, for notes; & by this meanes, they reduce to their owne iudgements, which is the true Church, seeing they will

not acknowledge the *word* to be purely *preached*, or the *Sacraments* to be rightly *administred*, but when and where their *Priuate Spirit* out of its *Pythagorean* and controwling Chaire vouchsafes so to pronouce.

By all this now we may see, how wholy *Negatiue*, the Protestant is (& indeed so *Negatiue* in al points, as that it may be feared, he in the end will deny his owne being:) for as heer aboue we haue shewed, that his Religion consisteth in pure *denyall* of our *Positiue and Affirmatiue* Articles; so in this Chapter, we haue layd downe how he labours to ouerthrow (by his like *denyalls*) the authority of all such *Affirmatiue and Positiue* Heads & principles, from whence the Catholikes for the fortifying of their owne faith and Religion, do drawe their proofes. In which kind of proceeding, the Prote-

Protestant deales no otherwise with the Catholike; then if a man, not being content; to seeke to depriue another of his state and liuing; should no lesse labour with all sedulity and care, to preclude and forstaule the true owner, of all meanes for his regayning, and recouering his sayd state.

That Sundry of the most learned Protestants (as not houlding a Negatiue fayth, to be any reall fayth at all) agree with the Catholikes, in belieuing the Affirmatiue Articles of the Catholike fayth.

CHAP. XVIII.

Δεύτερα φρονοῦσι σοφώτεροι (t), sayth the greek sentéce; to which may well seeme to allude in sense, (though

(t) Id est Secundæ cogitationes, prudentiores.

(though not in wordes) that o-
ther saying: (2) πάλιν δεομῆναι μᾶλλον
ἢ δεσμεῖν κακῶς. The meaning of
which two sentences diuers of our
learned Aduersaries haue thought
good to incorporate in their owne
writings. Who vpon their later &
more retired thoughts; and houl-
ding it a greater honour, rather to
returne well backe in their iudge-
ments, then to proceed badly for-
ward, haue wholy disclaimed from
this their *Negatiue fayth*: For ma-
ny of thē there are, who well wei-
ghing the emptines of their owne
Religion, as consisting onely of
Positions, which is (as is aboue made
cleare) but an annihilation of all
Positiue and true Fayth, & coun-
ting it altogether vnworthy, that
such a nakednes of Religiō should
for-euer haue a working influence
ouer their iudgments, haue there-
fore

(2) *Praestat retrosum currere, quam male currere.*

re at the length (vpon their la-
er, & more mature deliberation)
diuers weighty points wholy re-
ected this *Negatiue Religion*, and
place thereof haue fully imbra-
ed and entertayned the contrary
Affirmatiue Articles of fayth, euer
nătained by the Church of Rome.
will insist in twenty principall
rticles of our Catholike Religiõ,
and consequently almost in the
whole body of the Catholik faith)
which the more graue, impar-
iall, and dispassionate Protestants
doe giue their full assent, belie-
ing them be most true and com-
onant to Gods sacred word. To
et downe the Protestants owne
wordes in proofe hereof, it would
e needlesse, and ouer-labourſome
n regard both of the multiplicity
f the Protestant Authours affir-
ming so much; as also of the great
variety

variety of the *Affimatiue* Catholike Articles mantayned by thé. Therefore to take a ſhorter cut, I will ſet downe (only by way of Reference) the places in the Proteſtants bookes, in which the ſayd Catholike doctrines are by them fully taught, and defended.

1. And to beginne. The doctrine of the *Reall preſence*, in the holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* to the bodily mouth, is affirmed not only by *Luther*, but by all the *Lutheranes* without exception; they taking their name of *Lutheranes* from him, in regard of ſuch their defence, and beliefe of the ſayd doctrine; therefore it is booteles eyther to ſet downe the particular names of them, or to make reference to ſuch places of their writings, wherein they teach and iuſtify the ſayd doctrine; they

chie-

chiefly differing from the Catholike in the manner of the Presence.

2. The *Reall Presence*, not only of the *efficacy* & vertue of Christs body, but also of the body it selfe, after a wonderfull and incomprehensible manner to the *mouth of fayth*, is iustifyed by (a) *Caluin*, by (b) *M. Hooker*, by (c) *D. VVhitakers*, by (d) *Bucer*, by (e) *M. Ryder*, and finally by the (f) *Confessiõ of Belgia*: but contradicted for Popish doctrine by *Zwinglius*, and almost all other Sacramentaries, and particulerly by *Ludouicus Alemannus*, who thus writeth: *Neque etiam per fidem, seu incomprehensibili modo, vt vocant, quia hoc totum imaginarium, & repugnat apertissimè Dei verbo.*

3. That *Sacraments* doe not only signify, but *conferre Grace*, where a true disposition is in the

(a) *Instit. lib. 4 c. 18. sect. 7. & 32.*
(b) In his Eccesiast. policy l. 5. sect. 67 pag. 174. & 177.
(c) *Contra Durœum pag. 169.*
(d) *In Script. Anglican. pag. 548. & 549.*
(e) In his friendly *censure* in the third leaf.
(f) In the English Harmony pag. 434.

Recea-

Receauers, is mantayned by (g) *Iacobus Andreas*, (h) *D. Whitakers*, (i) *D. Bilson*, by (k) *Osiander*, (l) *M. Hooker*, and finally by (m) *Melanæthon*, who thus writeth of this poynt. *Repudianda est Swinglij opinio, qui tantùm ciuili modo iudicat de signis: scilicet Sacramenta tantùm notas esse professionis &c.*

(g) *In epitom. Colloq. Montisbelgar. p. 53. & pag. 401.*
(h) *Contra Durum l. 6. p. 662.*
(i) *In his true difference, part 4. p. 599.*
(k) *In Enchirid. Controuers. quæst. Aug. Confessionis Tetrad. 4. p. 272.*
(l) *In his Eccleiast. policy l. 5 sect. 57. p. 217. & 218.*
(m) *In ca. 4. epist ad Romanos.*

4. That *Christ* after his passion *descended in soule into Hell*, is affirmed by (n) *D. Hill*, by (o) *Aretius*, *Melanæthon*, and *M. Nowell*; they being alledged by D. *Hill* to the same purpose. Add heerto that *Lymbus Patrum* (whereunto we Catholikes belieue, that *Christ* did descend in soule after his death) is affirmed by (p) *Oecolampadius*, (q) *Swinglius*, (r) *Peter Martyr*, and (s) *Bullin-*

(n) *In his speciall Treatise of that title printed 1592.*
(o) *Alledged by D. Hill vbi supra.*
(p) *In Lib. Epist. Swingl. & Oecolamp. l. 1. p. 19.*
(q) *In lib. ep. Swingl. & Oecolamp. l. 5. p. 590. & 561.*
(r) *In his com. places in Engl. part. 2. cap. 18. pag. 221.*
(s) *In his Decads fol.*

Bullinger.

5. *Purgatory* is taught by (t) *Luther, in disputat. Lypsica cum Eckio,* and by (u) Latimer. *That temporall punishment is reserued by God,* to satisfy his Iustice for sinne already cõmitted (which is the ground of *Purgatory*) is taught by diuers Protestants; to wit, by the Publike (x) *Confessiõs* in the *Harmony*, by (y) *Iaspar Oleuianus*, & by (z) *Iohn Knox*.

6. The *visibility of the Church* at all tymes, is affirmed by (a) *Melanthon*, by (b) *D. Humfrey*, (c) *D. Field* (d) *Peter Martyr*, & (e) *Enoch Clapham*, and diuers other learned Protestants for breuity heer omitted; though contradicted for Popish by (f) *D. Fulke*, (g) *D. Willet*, and many others.

(t) Tom. 2. Vvittemb. in resolut. de Inaug. Conclus. 15. fol. 112.
(u) M. Fox. Acts. Mon. p. 1313.
(x) p. 229.
(y) In Symbolum p. 8.
(z) In his Answere against the Aduersaries of Gods praedestination. pa. 215. 216. 217.
(a) In loc. comm. edit. 1561. C. vel. 1. 2. (b) In lesuitism. part. 1. pa. 3. p. 240. (c) In 1. of the Church. c. 10. pag. 5. (d) In his 9 annexed to his Comm-places in Engl. p. 155. (e) In his soueraigne Remedy against Schisme. p. 1. & 2. In the tower disputat. with Edmund Cãpian, the second dayes Conference. (f) In his Synops. p. 60.

O 7. In-

7. *Inuocation of Saints*, maintayned by (h) *Luther*, who thus writeth hereof: *De intercessione Sanctorum, cum tota Ecclesia sentio; & iudico Sanctos à nobis honorandos esse atq; inuocandos*: vy certayne Protestants (i) *in Polonia*, by (k) *Thomas Bilney*, by (l) *Latimer*, and by (m) *Oecolampadius*. And (as the ground heerof) *Intercession of Saints* is auerred by (n) *Oecolampadius*, and (o) *Latimer*.

8. *Freewill*, taught by *Snecanus*, & *Hemingius*, as (p) *D. Villet acknowledgeth*; and beleiued by diuers Protestants, mentioned in (q) *Fox* his history.

9. The *power of Priests* not only to pronounce, but to *giue Remission of sinnes* (and consequently, that *Confession of sinnes is allowed*; seeing how can the Priest know, what sinnes are to be remitted, &

what

(h) *Luth. in purgat. quorundam Art.*

(i) Of this see *Hasse-renfens, in locis Theolog. l. 3. stat. 4. loc. 5. p. 463.*

(k) *Vide Fox Act. Mon. 462.*

(l) *Act. Mon. pa. 1312. & 1315.*

(m) *Orat. in Chryso. de Iuuentio & Maximo.*

(n) *Oecol. vbi sup.*

(o) *Fox Act. Mon. p. 1312.*

(p) *In his Synops. printed 1600. p. 808.*

(q) *Act. Mon. p. 1533.*

what sinnes to be retayned, according to the wordes of the Scripture, *whose sinnes you remit &c. and whose sinnes you retayne &c.* except he know particulerly the sinnes of the penitēt?) is taught by the English *Communion booke*, in the visitation of the sicke, where the Priest sayth: *And by his Authority committed to me, I absolue thee from thy sinnes &c.* (r) *Lobechius* Doctour and Professor in the Vniuersity of *Rostock*, by (s) *Andreas Althamerus*, by (t) *Sarcerius*, by (u) *Spandeburge*, & finally by (x) *Iacobus Helbrunerus*. And hence it is, that *Absolution* is affirmed by *Melāthon*, to be (as his words are) (y) *properly a Sacrament*.

10. The *Indifferency of Communion vnder one, or both kinds*, maintayned by (z) *Luther*, by (a) *Melanthon*, and (b) *Bucer*. Luthers

(r) *In his disp. Theo. p. 501.*
(s) *In Concil. locorum Scripturæ repugnantium. lin. 194. fol. 218.*
(t) *In loc. com. tom. 1. de potestate Eccles. f. 305.*
(u) *In his Margarita Theol pa. 116. & 117.*
(x) *In Swenckfildio Calumnis. p. 55.*
(y) *Melanth. in Apol. Confess. Aug. Art. 13 de numero & vsu Sacramentorum, fol. 161.*
(z) *Luth. in Ep. ad Bohemos, & l. de vtraque specie Sacram.*
(a) *Melanth. in Cent. Epi. Theol ep. 74. pa. 158.*
(b) Bucer in the Confession of Ratisbon.

(c) Luth in cap. Babi. c. de Eucharistia.
(d) In his treatise of the Church. p. 239.
(e) l. epist. Swingl. & Oecolamp. p. 301.
(f) to. 2. l. de Baptis. fol. 90.
(g) In his defence. p. 339.
(h) D. Couel in his Answere to Iohn Burges. p. 139.
(i) D. Couel in his examination of the Plea of the Innocents. pag. 104.
(k) Hooker Eccles. Pol. l. 2. sect. 7. pag. 118.

wordes are these: (c) *They sinne not agaynst Christ, who vse one kind, seeing Christ hath not commaunded to vse both, but hath left it to the will of euery one &c.*

11. That there are *certaine vnwritten Traditions* to be obserued, is confessed by (d) *D. Field*; of the Baptisme of Infants, by (e) *Oecolampadius*, and by (f) *Swinglius*, and in like manner by our (g) *Doctour Whitgift*: of the Tradition of Easter, by (h) *D. Couell*: of the Tradition of the vse of the Crosse, and the name (i) *Archbishop*, by (k) *M. Hooker*, who answereth diuers Authorities out of certaine Fathers vsually alledged by other Protestants in behalfe of only Scripture. And finally by the *Archbishop of Canterbury*, touching Apostolicall Ordination, in the *Conference* before the King. *pag.* 11.

12. That

12. That the *Commandements may be kept*, and are not impossible; taught by *M.* (l) *Hooker*, by *D.* (m) *Castalio*, by *M.* (n) *Perkins*, & (o) *D. Couell.*

13. That there are *Euangelicall Counsells*, which are such as that a man in performing them doth more then he is by God commãded; is taught by (p) *Luther*, (q) *M. Hooker*, and (r) *D. Couell.* Ad heerto, that our good *workes* proceeding from fayth, and in regard of Christs passion and promise, are *Meritorious*, & *deseruing*, is maintayned by (s) *Melanchthon*, by the *Publike* (t) *Confessions in the Harmony*, *by* (u) *Spandeburge*, *by* (x) *M. Hooker.*

14. *Peters Primacy*, maintayned by (y) *Caluin*, by (z) *D. VVhitgift*,

(l) Eccles. Pol. lib. 2. pag. 113. (m) Lib. de perfect. obedient. legis Dei. (n) In his reformed Catholike pag. 26. & 31. (o) In his defence of M. Hooker art. 7. pag. 54. (p) In assert. art 30 (q) Eccles. Pol. lib. 3. sect. 8. pa. 140. (r) In his defence of M. Hooker art. 8. pag. 50. 51. 52. (s) In loc. com. de bonis operib. circa medium. (t) Pag. 495. & 279.

(u) In Margar. Theol. p. 48. & 50. (x) Eccles. Pol. l. 3. sect. 72. pag. 208. (y) As he is alledged by D. Whitgift in his defence, pag. 113. & 469. (z) VVhitgift vbi supra.

gift, by (a) *Musculus*, and by (b) D. *Bridges* Bishop of *Oxford*.

15. *Prayer for the dead*, defended by (c) *Luther*, & *Vrbanus Rhegius*, by (d) *Martin Bucer*, by (e) *Willia Torpe*, and (f) by the *Communion booke* in King Edwards reigne.

16. Touching *Vniuersality of grace*, and that *Christ* dyed for all with intention on his part to haue all men saued, if so they will accept of his grace, which doctrine ouerthroweth the Protestants doctrine of *Reprobation*, being but a meer *Negation* to the doctrine of the *Vniuersality of Grace*: Now this doctrine of *Vniuersality of grace*, is taught by (g) *Swinglius*, by (h) M. *Smith*, by (i) *Snecanus*, by (k) M. *Gibbons*, by (l) *Hemingius*, by (m) *Hiperius*

(a) *Musculus* so alledged by D. *Whitgift vbi supra.*

(b) D. *Brid.* In his defece of the gouernmẽt &c. pag. 445. 446.

(c) as witnesseth *Vrbanus Rhegius in prima parte operum in formula cautè loquẽdi cap. de Sanctorum cultu.*

(d) In his *scripta Anglicana. p.* 450.

(e) *Fox Act. Mon.* pag. 149.

(f) Printed 1549. fol. 116. & 140. (g) *In lib. Epist. Oecol. & Swingl.* 1. pag. 274. (h) In his treatise of prayer in generall for all mankind. (i) *In method. descript* pag. 430. (k) In his Questions vpon Genesis pag. 118. (l) *Enchiridion class.* 3. *pag.* 220. & 221. (m) *In method. Theol. lib.* 2. *p.* 431. 435. 436.

perius, by (n) *M. Hooker*, by (o) *Bullinger*: and finally, by most of the learned *Lutheranes*, and diuers other learned *Caluinists*, as witnesseth (p) *Huberus*: as also by diuers learned Bishops of England, and other English Doctours; all who are therefore at this tyme styled *Arminians* by their Aduersaries.

17. *Worshipping of Images*, defended by certayne Protestants of Germany (as (q) *Beza* witnesseth) by *Bilney* a Protestant, as (r) *M. Fox* confesseth. And answerably heer-to, the *bowing* and reuerence giuen at the *name of Iesus* (seeing this is the same to the eare, which the Image is to the Eye) is taught by Queene *Elizabeths* (s) Iniunctions, by (t) *Zachius*, by (u) *D. Whitgift*, by (x) *M. Leonard Wright*, by (y) *Musculus*.

18. That *Christ* was from his Na-

(n) *Eccles. policy l. 5. pag. 104.*
(o) Vpon the Apocal. in English f. 79
(p) In his Theses, p. 159. 163. 194. 166. & 167. & sequent.
(q) In his respons. *ad acta colloq Montiu-Belgar. pars altera pag 22.*
(r) *Act. Mo. p. 462. & 464.*
(s) *Art. 25*
(t) *In epist. Pauli ad Philippens. Colos. Thessal. in Philip. ca. 2. v. 10 f. 121. col. 2.*
(u) In his defence, *pag. 742.*
(x) In his summons for slee-

Natiuity *full of knowledge*, & free from *Ignorance*, taught by (z) *Iacobus Andreas*, (a) by *Osiander*, and finally by most *Lutheran* Protestants, whose names and References were ouer-labourſome to ſet downe; Yet is this doctrine contradicted by (b) *Beza*, by (c) *D. Sutcliffe*, and by (d) *D. VVillet.*

19. That *Christ is God of God*, and hath his Subſtance of his Father, as the whole Catholicke Church holdeth; maintained by (e) M. *Fox*, by (f) *Lobechius*, by (g) *D. Doue*, by (h) *Melanthon*, by (i) M. *Hooker*, by (k) D *Couell*, and finally by the (l) *Confeſsion of Belgia*, in the *Harmony*. But contradicted by (m) *Caluin*, (n) *Beza*, (o) *D. VVhitakers*, and many others.

20. Laſtly,

pers p. 30.
(y) *In loc. com p.* 59.
(z) Alledged by Beza, *in reſponſ. ad Act colloq. Mont. ſ. belgar. part.* 1 *p.* 147. & 480.
(a) *In Enchirid. Controuerſ.* printed *Tubing.* 1630. *p.* 146. 147.
(b) *In reſp. ad Act. colloq. Montisb. part.* 1. *p.* 147.
(c) In his reuiew of *D. Kelli-* Surucy printed 1606 *p.* 55.
(d) In his Synops. *p.* 509. & 600. As alſo gainſaid by moſt of the Puritanes. (e) *In Apoc. p.* 474. (f) *In diſp. 10. Theol. p.* 49. (g) In his Confut of Atheiſme *p.* 37. (h) *In loc. com. an.* 1561 *p.* 24. (i) *Eccl. pol. l.* 5 *p.* 113. (k) In his defence of *M. Hooker p.* 16. & 17. (l) *pag* 14. (m) In his explicat. *perfidiæ Valent. Gentilis. extam* in his *tract. Theol p.* 771.

20. Lastly, that *Antichrist is yet to come* (and consequently that the Bishop of Rome is not *Antichrist* (which position of the Protestants is but a *Negation* of the Bishop of Rome being *Christ his Vicar* vpon earth) is taught by (p) *Zanchius*, (q) *Franciscus Lambertus*, and according to (r) D. *Doue* his iudgement, by diuers other Protestants: yet contradicted by most Protestants & Puritanes of these dayes.

Hitherto of these twenty *Affirmatiue* Cath. points, taught by learned Protestāts; in teaching & beleiuing of which, it followeth, that of necessity, the sayd Protestants must disauow and reiect the contrary *Negatiue* Tenets maintained by other Protestants.

(n) Contra Heshusium.
(o) Contra Camp. rat. 8.
(p) In epist. Pauli ad Philip. Coloss. Thessalon pag. 246.
(q) See the booke entituled *Antichristus, siue Prognostica finis mundi*, pag. 74. 78 79. See also *Fran. Liberus* vpō this poinct in his Cōment. vpon the Reuelat.
(r) D. Doue in his ser- *Some Pro-*

mon of the secōd comming of Christ, thus sayth. *testants make a doubt whether Antichrist be yet reuealed or no.*

Certayne Porisмata, or Resultancies, rising out of the seuerall passages of this Treatise.

CHAP. XIX.

IN the precedent Chapters and passages of this Treatise, my vndertaken taske in prouing Protestancy to be an *Irreality* & *Non-entity*, is (I hope) fully accomplished: I will in this place extract from the same passages certayne *Resultancies*, by inferentiall deductions.

1. The first of these shalbe, that since Protestancy is in it selfe, but a *priuation* or *denyall*, of fayth, and a meere *Nothing*; that therefore *God*, who is not the Authour of *Priuations* and *defects*, did neuer make or institute Protestancy, nor will

will be worſhipped with ſuch an empty, and imaginary Religion. For how can it enter into any braine, but to weene, that he, frō whome ſtreame the different welſprings and ſources of all things, for he is (a) *fons vitæ*, (b) *fons ſapientiæ*, (c) *fons aquæ viuæ*: he who being immutable, altereth all things; euer worketh, yet euer quiet; often changeth his actions, yet neuer changeth his determinations; (d) *Ego ſum Dominus & non mutor*: he, who is more ancient then all *Eternity*; more large and diffuſe, then any *magnitude*; more ſtrong, then all *Power*: He that is aboue all, yet lower then all; ſo becomming to the whole *vniuerſe* both the *Circumference* and *Center*: He, who is the origen of al things, being the *Efficient* cauſe of *All*, the *Forme* of *All*, and the *End* of

(a) Pſal. 35
(b) Eccl. 1.
(c) Hier. 2
(d) Malac.

All

All: He, who as a *Sunne* (placed in the middest of the whole world) casteth forth on ech side innumerable beams of his vneclypsed radiancy and power, by the which beames he createth, produceth & conserueth all things: To conclude, he, whome truly to describe, all tongues are but dumbe: (e) *Ad eloquendam* Dei *Maiestatem, omnis eloquentia muta est.* Now, heer I first demaund: can it enter into I say, any braine to imagine, that this most potēt, & most wise God, should institute a fayth and Religion, by the which only he will be truly honoured, and by meanes whereof the soule of Man shall arriue to its eternall beatitude, the *Terminus ad quem*, for which it was created; which Religion is (as aboue is proued) but a *Chimera*, & *Irreality*?

(e) Tertul. de Trinit.

Second-

Secondly, I demand, whether this wise, potent, and Iust God, who in infinite places of his sacred (f) Word, hath thundred out his most dreadfull Comminations & threats agaynst Sinne, and the commiters thereof, will take delight in that Religion and fayth, whose many Articles, Principles, or *Tenets* do euen exhale & breath forth (as an ordure or stench out of a filthy and pudled Chānell) into the belieuers will, improbity, sensuality, Iniustice, and all dissolution what socuer in conuersation & māners? But such are the Protestants Articles of *denying* Free-will, *denying* the possibility of keeping the Comandements, *denying* of Purgatory, *denying* Iustificatiō by works, depressing of Virginity, Pouerty, and Obedience, & such other Protestanticall *Tenets* aboue dil-

(f) As in Psal. 9. & 10. God shall rayne snares vpō sinners, fire and brimstone, and blasts of stormes, the portion of their Cup. And agayne Ecclesiasticus 40. death, blood, contention, edge of sword, oppression hunger, contrition &c. all all these are created for sinners. And yet more. Psal. 91. All they that worke iniquity shall be cōfounded. Besids innumerable other places.

diſcourſed of; ſo true it is, that Fayth is of a ſpecular nature, euer in its operation, reflecting backe vpon the vnderſtanding and will.

2. The ſecond *Poriſma*, iſſuing out of this diſcourſe, may be this. We all know, that the Proteſtants doe in their pulpits and els where with great clamour and noyſe vociferate, and cry out, that the *Pope is Antichriſt*: Now, heer I aske, whether in a ſolide, and not preoccupated iudgment, it is not more probable, that the Proteſtants are the Precurſours & forerunners of *Antichriſt*, (as playning and cauening the way againſt his comming) then that the Pope is *Antichriſt*. My reaſon is this: In this Treatiſe it is abundantly proued, that the Proteſtant *denyeth* moſt points of our Chriſtian and Catholike Religion; ſo as Proteſtancy

ſtancy eſſentially reſteth in ſuch *Negations*. This being ſo, how fitly doth this kind of *denyalls* and *Negations* ſort to *Antichriſt*, who at his comming ſhall by his *denying* of Chriſtian Religion, and all the Articles therof, ſeeke (what in him lyeth) to annihilate & ouerthrow the ſayd Chriſtian Religion; and for ſuch his proceeding ſome (g) Fathers doe conieƈture, that his name ſhalbe ἀρνοῦμαι, ſignifying *Nego*: and this both by reaſõ, that this greeke word maketh vp the number, to wit (h) 666. which is aſcribed peculiarly to *Antichriſt*, as alſo in that *Antichriſt* and his Miniſters ſhal at his comming, both in their *denyalls* and workes, labour mightily to euert Chriſtian Religion. And if S. *Iohn* ſayth truly, that euery one, who in any ſort *denieth Ieſus* to be *Chriſt*,

(g) ſowriteth Hypolytus Martyr, in orat de conſummatione mundi.

(h) Apocal. 13.

may

may figuratiuely be tearmed *Antichrist*; (i) *Quis est mendax, nisi qui negat Iesum esse Christum? & hic est Antichristus &c.* how fully, simply, and absolutely then shall the true *Antichrist* at his comming *deny Iesus to be Christ?* And consequently shall *deny* all the particular mysteries of Christianity.

(i) Ioan. 2.

3. My third *Resultancy* respecteth the Protestants seuerall different Translations of the Scripture, and their seuerall different settings forth of their *Comon Booke of Prayer* (as is aboue shewed;) and yet euen at this day, they are neither content with the last Trãslation of the Bible, or last publishing of the Booke of Common Prayer, though all corrected and reformed by way of *Negatiues*; but charging thẽ with many vntruths, corruptions, and blasphemyes; &

most earnestly thirsting after a new Translation, and a new composition of the Communion Booke if so they could obtayne it. From whence we conclude, from their owne pens, that hitherto the Protestāts neuer enioyed the true and vncorrupted Scripture, and a forme or cōmon Booke of Praier, free from Errours.

Now this being granted by the, how mightily are the Protestants foyled thereby? For first whereas their owne doctrine is, that the (k) *Scripture is the sole Iudge of Controuersies in Religion*, they are heerby, by their owne implicite confessions, euen as yet depriued of this Iudge: seeing themselues do grant, that the pure and vncorrupted Scripture, and not as it is abastarded with deprauations, ought to be this Iudge. Againe,

(k) Luther teacheth præfat. Assertionis suæ. Calvin. lib. 4. Instit. c. 9. Kemnit. in Examen. Concil. Trident. Sess. 4. Melanthon loc. de Ecclesia.

to be depriued of the true Scripture) as themselues by acknowledging all former Translations to be impure, & false, must consequetly grant they are) is to be depriued of one of Gods chiefest pledges of mans saluation; the Scripture of God, and the necessary deductions out of it, being the *spirituall meates*, wherwith (with reference to his saluation) the vnderstanding of mans soule is chiefly fed & nourished: * *Verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis, Spiritus & vita sunt.*

* Ioan 6.

And as touching the want of a true Communion Booke of Praier (the which the Protestãts by their former excepting against al Communiõ Books hitherto published, do acknowledg to want) the Protestants do heerin potentially grant, thathitherto they haue notknown how

how, and in what manner they ought to pray; which how great a spiritual detrimẽt it is, who seeth not? since by Praier we ouercome him, who is inuincible; praier indeed being the mother & daughter of teares; by which teares (seconded with the help of the Sacraments) the blemishes and spots of our soules are washed out: (l) *Lauabis me, & super niuem dealbabor.* (l) Psal. 50.

4. The fourth. It is in the former passages proued, euen from the frequent Confessions of the learned Protestants; that the Protestant Church hath for many ages beene Inuisible, or rather during those tymes vtterly extinct. Now this confessed disparition & vanishing away of their Church out of the sight of all men; doth necessarily inuolue in it selfe, that the Protestant Church is not; nor

can be the true Church of God, since the true Church of God must at all tymes enioy a continual & vneclipsed splendour of its owne *visibility*. I will enleauen this my Assertiõ, both with the authority of holy Scripture, & the volũtary acknowledgmẽts of our learned aduersaries. And not to ouercharge the Reader, with a needles surplusage of many testimonies; some few (and those pertinent) shall serue. And first we thus read to be prophecyed of the Church of God: (m) *The Iles shall waite for thee, their Kings shall minister vnto thee, and thy gates shall be continually open, neyther day nor night shall they be shut, that men may bring to thee the riches of the Gentils.* And in the new Testament, it is sayd of our Sauiour: (n) *He gaue Pastours and Doctours to the consummation of Saints,*

(m) Isa. 60

(n) Ephes. 4.

Saints &c. till we all meete in the vnity of faith: that is (as is els where in this Treatise shewed) euen by the Protestants *scholia*, (o) *for euer*. Now, these former diuine Oracles prouing an vninterupted visibility of the Church of God, are atteded on with the like acknowledgments euen of the Protestants: for *Melancthon* (after he had alledged certaine places of Scripture, in proofe of the Churches euer *visibility*) doth thus write: (p) *Hi & similes loci &c.* *These, and such lyke places of Scripture, non de Idæa Platonica, sed de Ecclesia visibili loquuntur.* And D. *Field* accordeth therto, thus saying: (q) *It is true that Bellarmine laboureth in vaine, in prouing that there is, & alwayes hath beene a visible Church &c. for all this we most willingly yield vnto.* Finally D. *Humfrey* thus sealeth vp the truth

(o) D. Fulke against the Rhemish Testamét *in Ephes.* 4

(p) Melancthon *in locis com. edit. anno* 1561. *cap. de Ecclesia.*

(q) D. *Field lib.* 1. of the Church. *cap.* 10.

truth hereof: (r) *Oportet Ecclesiam esse conspicuam, Conclusio est clarissima. It is a manifest Conclusion, that the Church is to be conspicuous, or visible.* Now heer aboue is deliuered, first, that the Protestant Church hath for many ages been *Inuisible*: Secondly, (as proued both from the Scriptures, and from our Aduersaries doctrine) that the true Church of God must at all tymes be *visible*, and conspicuous. If thé you will mingle these two *Ingredients* togeather, you shall finde, that the *Compound* made of them, will be this: *That the Protestants Church for want of a continuall visibility at all tymes, is not the true Church of God.* The same deductiō of prouing the Protestant Church not to be the true Church of God, may be made from the confessed want of administring the word &

(r) D. Humfrey in Iesuitis. part. 2. c. 3.

Sa-

Sacraments in the sayd Church. For seeing the Administration of the word & Sacraméts are the essentiall Notes of the true Church in the Protestants iudgments; & seeing withall by their owne Confessions aboue expressed, their Church hath wanted for more thé a thousand yeares togeather, this so necessary Administration of the word and Sacraments; it then inecuitably followeth, that the Protestant Church (for want of these Essetial notes of the true Church) is not the true Church of God, euen by their owne doctrine.

5. The fifth is to obserue, the aboue confessed Truth of our Catholike Religion in all the chiefest Articles eué from the Aduersaries pens. This is the greatest & most conuincing proofe that can be desired; for heere marke, what both the

the Fathers and the Proteſtants ſpeake of this kind of proofe.

Firſt then (*Irenæus lib. 4. c. 14.*) thus writeth heerof: *It is an vnanſwerable proofe, which bringeth atteſtation from the Aduerſaries themſelues.* With whome conſpires *S. Auſtin* (*lib. contra Donatiſtas cap. 24.*) ſaying, *the truth is more forcible to wring out Confeſsion, then any racke or torment.* To both which Fathers *D. VVhitaker* (*contra Bellar. l. de Eccleſ. controuerſ. 2. q. 5. c. 14.*) ſubſcribes in theſe wordes: *The Argumẽt muſt be ſtrong and efficacious, which is taken from the Confeſsion of the Aduerſaries: And I doe freely acknowledge, that the truth is able to extort teſtimonies euen frõ its enemyes.* Thus *D. VVhitaker.* Now, that theſe Proteſtants (maintaining our former Catholike Articles) were perſuaded, that the ſayd Catholike

points receaued their warranted proofe from the sacred Scripture, appeareth euidently from this one Consideration; to wit, because all the former alledged Protestants (some foure or fiue only excepted) do wholy reiect the doctrine of *Traditions*; confidently & vnanimously teaching, that nothing is to be belieued, as an Article of Fayth, but what hath its expresse warrant and authority from the written word of God.

6. The last resultancy is, that the many *Negatiue Reformations* of Protestancy do finally end in *Iudaisme*, *Turcisme*, and an vtter *abnegation of Christian Religion*. The most deplorable and disconsolate state of sundry eminent Caluinists preacheth the truth of this my Assertion: for diuers of them neuer stayed in the endles progresse of

refyning their Religion by *Negations*, till at the close of all, they *denyed* all Articles of Christian Religion, and the supreme mystery of the most *Blessed Trinity*; & therupon apostating from Christianity, they became most blasphemous *Iewes*, or *Turkes*; so true it is, that *Turcisme*, and *Iudaisme* is the last colour, dye, or tincture, that Protestancy taketh. Some few Examples heereof among many, I will in this place retaile; And first *Dauid George*, who was a markable Protestant, and once Professour at (s) *Basill*; did (after many *Negations*) wholy *deny* the Christian Faith, & became a diuelliſh (t) *Apostata*. Againe *Andreas Volanus* (an eminent Caluinist) not only became a *Turke*, but corrupted diuers others with his pestilet writings (u) agaynst the *B. Trinity*.

(s) *Ofiid. Cent. 16. part. 2. p 647.* saith of Dauid George *vtebatur publico verbi Ministerio Basilienſi.*

(t) See *Historia Dauidis Georgij* printed at Antwerp. 1568. published by the Diuines of Basill.

(u) *In Parænes.*

Ochinus

Ochinus also, who with *Peter Martyr*, first planted Protestancy (by his *denying of many Articles* of our Catholike Religion) heer in England in King *Edward* the sixt his dayes, did finally become a *Iew*. This is witnessed by (x) *Zanchius*, (y) *Conradus Stusselburge*, two Protestants, and (z) *Beza* who tearmeth *Ochinus*, *impurus Apostata*.

Lelius Socinus (once brought vp in the schoole of *Geneua*) forsook his Christianity, and did write a booke against the *B. Trinity*; of whome *Beza* thus speaketh: (a) *Mihi quidem videtur omnes Corruptores longè superasse*. In like sort *Alamanus*, a Swinglian, and once deare to (b) *Beza*, in the end *denyed* the Christian faith, & became a Iew; of whome *Beza* thus cõplaineth: *Alamannum affirmant ad Iudaismũ defeciſſe*. Lastly *Neuserus*, who was chiefe

(x) In his booke *de tribus Elohim*.

(y) *In Theolog. Calumnist. lib. 1. fol. 9.*

(z) *Beza in Poligam. pag. 4.*

(a) *Beza epi. Theol. epist. 81.*

(b) So witnesseth *Conrad. Slusselb. in Theolog. Calu. l. 2. art. 2.*

(c) *Beza in epist. 65. p. 308.*

chiefe Pastour of *Heidelberge* in the *Palatinate*, in the end *abnegated* all Christian Religion, and becomming a *Turke*, caused himselfe to be circumcised at *Constantinople*, as (d) *Osiander* the Protestãt doth witnesse, thus writing of him: *Adam Neuserus Pastor Heidelbergensis &c. prolapsus in Turcismum Constantinopoli circumcisus*. But I will close vp this Scene with the Testimony of this *Neuserus*, who thus writeth of himselfe, and of other Caluinists, *denying* the Blessed Trinity: (e) *None is known in our times to be made an Arian* (but an *Arian* is not much inferiour to a *Turke*, or *Iew*) *who was not a Caluinist, as Seruetus, Blãdrata, Paulus Alchiamus, Genetlis, Gebraldus, Siluanus, and others; therefore who feareth to fall into Arianisme, let him take heed of Caluinisme.* Thus *Neuserus*.

(d) *Osiader Cent. 16. part. 2. p. 858.*

(e) *Osiader relateth, that Neuserus did write these words from Constantinople (being there circumcised) to one Gerlachius, a Protestant Preacher at Tubinga. vid. Osiander in epitom. Cent. 16. pag. 209.*

And

And thus farre of these former *Porismata*; and concerning this last, we heere see, how the many small riuers (as I may terme thē) of our *Negatiue* Reformations neuer cease running, till in the end they all disgorge themselues into the mayne Ocean of *Apostasy*, and *Infidelity*: So certayne it is, that a *Caluinist*, being lastly sublimated and refyned by *Negations*, becommeth an *Arian*, *Turke*, or *Iew*.

That the Catholike Church, and the Protestant Church, are not one and the same Church: though some Protestants teach the Contrary, for the supporting of their owne Church.

CHAP. XX.

SVch is the refractory cõtumacy of *Innouation* of fayth, that when it is driuen to the greatest straytes by way of dispute, yet before it will acknowledge its owne Errours, it will labour to take sãctuary, though in the middest of its own enemies. According heerto we finde, that when the Protestants are irrepliably, and most dangerously pressed with the *Inuisibility*, or want of *Succession of Pastours* in their Church: & that for such

such want their Church cannot be true Church of God; They then as being depriued of all other euading meanes, are content, out of the immenseneſſe, forſooth, of their owne good will, (but indeed for the better ſupporting of their Church) to acknowledg, that the Proteſtant Church, and the Catholike are both but one, and the ſame Church. But do the Catholikes accept of this their kindnes? No, (a) *Timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes*. Their Calumny heer reſteth, in that without ſuch their *Tenet*, their own Church euidētly appeareth to come to vtter ruine & diſſolution. The truth of this poynt is ſo cleare, as that *M. Hooker* thus writeth hereof: (b) *We gladly acknowledge them of Rome to be of the family of Ieſus Chriſt.* And *D. Con-* (c) *nell*: (c)) *I cannot but wonder, that they*

(a) *Virg. Aeneid.*

(b) *lib. 3. Eccleſ. Pol. p. 130*

(c) D. Conuell in defence of Hooker

of

of Rome will aske, where our Church was before Luther? As if any were of opinion, that Luther did erect a new Church. But *M. Bunny* (no vulgar Protestant) dismasketh himselfe more openly, touching this point; & withall sheweth the reason, why himselfe and his brethrē so greedily begge this so much desired reconciliation; for thus he writeth: (d) *VVe are no seuerall Church from them, nor they from vs &c. All the diffirence betweene vs, is concerning the truer members.* And againe, (e) *It was euill done of them, who first vrged such a separation.* And then after he giueth his reason in these playne wordes: (f) *It is great probability with them* (meaning with the Catholikes) *that so we make our selues answerable to fynd out a distinct and seuerall Church from the Apostles age till this present; els needs we*

(d) Bunny in his Treatise

(e) Ibid. pag. 109.

(f) Ibid p. 96.

must

must acknowledge, that our Church is sprung of late, or since theirs. Thus these Protestants, for the vphoulding of their own Church, are forced to teach, that the Catholike Church & the Protestant, are but one and the same Church.

Now if any Protestant seeking to redeeme his Church from such dangers, as are in this Treatise threatned to fall vpon it; as (besides *Inuisibility*, and *want of Succession of Pastours*) the blemish of being an *Irreality*, and *Non-entity &c.* should for his last despairing refuge, answere with the former Authours, that the *Protestant Church and the Roman Church are but one*, & that seeing the Roman Church hath euer beene in being, and *Visible*; that therefore the Protestant Church (as being the same Church with the Roman) is heerby freed

from all those spots and blemishes of *Inuisibility*, *want of Succession*, *Irreality*, *want of true subsistence &c.* heer in this Treatise aboue inforced:

Therefore to preuent all such poore and needy tergiuersatiõ (for falshood would gladly shroud it selfe vnder the wings of truth) I will heer discouer the absurdity of this their supposall, by demõstrating, that the Catholike Church and the Protestant Church cannot be one and the same Church: so certaine it is, that *there is no Cõmunion betweene Christ, and Beliall.*

And first: If we take into our consideration, what it is, which maketh the true Church (for speaking of the Church of God, we must needs vnderstand thereby the true Church; seeing God hath no false Church) for that

that sentence of S. Cyprian is true: *adulterari non potest sponsa Christi, incorrupta est, & pudica.* [2] Cyprian lib. de Vnit. Eccles.

To this is replyed, that men professing the truth of Christian Religion, make this Church. Well then, if so it can be proued, that the Catholikes and the Protestats do maintaine such contrary Articles of fayth, as that of necessity the one part must be false, & consequetly not to be beleued by the Members of Christs Church; the followeth it, that these diffeonc Professours of them (I meane the Catholikes and the Protestants) cannot make One, and the same Church. And to come to this point: (though such disparity of fayth hath beene proued to be eué among the Protestants themselues aboue in this Treatise;) But if one Protestant thinke another

Proteſtant to be (for his ſuppoſed falſe fayth) no member of Chriſts Church, but an Heretike; then with much more reaſon we may pronounce the ſame betweene the Catholike and the Proteſtant.

Now, this poynt taketh its more euident demonſtration of proofe from this one conſideration; to wit, that the Catholike and the Proteſtant doe not belieue one & the ſame *Creed*. If then they both do not belieue one and the ſame *Creed* (and yet the *Creed* is but an abſtract or *Compendium* of the true fayth of chriſt) can it be poſſibly cõceaued, that the Catholicke and Proteſtant doe make one and the ſame Church? But to deſcend to the *Creed*. It is true, that the Proteſtant & Catholike doe in words recite one and the ſame *Creed*; but ſeeing it is the intended ſenſe of

the

the holy Ghost in euery Article thereof, and not the words, which make the *Creed*; it followeth that if the Catholike, and Protestant doe belieue the sayd Articles of the *Creed* in a different, or rather contrary sense, that then they doe not belieue the *Creed*; for to belieue the *Creed* in a false sense, is not to belieue it all: The *Creed* in this respect iustly challenging to it selfe that priuiledge, which the holy Scripture doth; of which S. *Ierome* thus writeth: (g) *Scripturæ non in legendo, sed in intelligendo consistunt.*

(g) S. Ierome in epist. ad Paulinum.

That this they doe, I wil exemplify in some Articles threof. And to beginne with that first Article *I belieue in God.* The *Catholike* belieues, that his *God* no way formally cooperates with man to sin; the *Protestant* belieues, that *his*

God (h) cooperateth, forceth, and impelleth a man to sinne, as is aboue in this Treatise shewed. The *Catholike* beliefues that *God* wil not punish man for the not obseruing of such precepts, which are not in mans power to obserue; the *Protestant* beliefues, that it is not in our power to keepe the *Ten Commandements*; and yet withall beliefues, that (i) *God* will punish man with euerlasting Torments, for his not keeping of the sayd *Ten Commandements*.

(h) Beza in his display of Popish Preachers. *pag.* 102. *Swingl. tom* 1 *de prouident. c.* 6. *fol.* 365. Caluin *Instit. l.* 1. *c.* 18.

(i) D. Reynolds in his second Conclusion annexed to his Conference. *p.* 697.

Briefly, the *Catholike* beliefues, that *his God* giues sufficient grace to all men, that they may be saued; The *Protestants God* decreeth diuers men, without any respect or preuision of their workes, to eternall damnation: for thus *Caluin* writeth: (k) *God doth ordayne by his Counsell, that amõg men some be borne*

(k) Caluin *Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 23. See Willet Synops. *p.* 154. affirming the same.

to eternall damnation from their mothers wombe. Touching the Article, of *Iudging the quicke and the dead*; The *Catholike* beleiues, that Christ at his comming to Iudgment will so iudge man, as that his good workes (receauing their force and vertue from Christs passion) shalbe rewarded: The *Protestant* beleiues, that (l) Christ will reward only a bare & naked faith.

(l) Calu. in Antid. Concil. Trident. Kemnitium in Exam. Concil. Trident.

Touching that, *I beleiue the Catholike Church*; The *Catholike* beleiues this Church to be a society of men, professing the present Romane fayth, of which some are predestinated, others reprobated. The (m) *Protestant* beleiues, that his Church consisteth only of the Elect and faythfull, and not of other sorts of men.

(m) Confess. August. art. 7. Luth. de Concil. & Eccles. Calu. l. 4. Instit.

Touching the Article of the *Communion of Saints*; The *Catholike*

he doth beleiue such a Communion to be between the soules in heauen, the soules in Purgatory, and men liuing in this world; as that the soules in Purgatory may be holpen by the praiers of the liuing & the liuing may be holpen by the intercessiō of the Saints in heauen; The *Protestant* denyeth (n) al such Communion betweene these seuerall parts of the Church.

(n) Brentius in Confess. Wittenb. c. de Purgat. Calu. l. 3. Instit. c. 5. sect. 6.

Concerning the Article of *forgiuenes of sinnes*, The *Catholike* beliefues, that actuall sinnes are forgiuen by the Sacrament of Penance, and that thereby the soule of man becommeth truly iust in the sight of God; obtayning by this meanes a true and *Inherent Iustice*: The *Protestant* acknowledgeth not any Sacrament of Penance; neyther doth he acknowledge any reall and (o) *Inherent Iustice*

(o) Calu. l. 3. Instit. c. 13. Kemnit. in Exam. Concil. Trident.

ſtice in man, but only an *imputatiue Iuſtice*, which is the *Iuſtice* of *Chriſt* imputed vnto vs.

Thus farre to ſhew that the *Catholike* and *Proteſtant* doe not beliue one and the ſame *Creed*; and conſequently, that one & the ſame Church cannot conſiſt of *Catholikes* and *Proteſtants*.

Secondly, the authority of *Generall Councells* condemning ſeuerall particuler doctrines for Hereſies, and the like authority of particuler *Orthodoxall Fathers* of the Primitiue Church, touching their like cõdemnation of many Proteſtanticall *Teners* for Hereſies, do ſufficiently euict, that the Proteſtant Church and the Catholicke Church, cannot be one and the ſame Church; for if they could, then would it follow, that the former old Hereſies aboue diſplayed

in the tenth Chapter, and now houlden by the Protestãts, should be no heresies; for if the Professours of the Roman fayth, & the maintainers of the sayd strange doctrines, could be members of one Church; then great wrong was offered by the Fathers and Councells, to brand such men in those former tymes for Heretiks, and their doctrines for Heresies.

We may add heerto, that if the ancient learned Fathers did teach that a man by holding onely one errour or heresy did cease therby to be a mẽber of Christs Church: as for example, *Iouinian* for teaching that *Virginity* and *Matrimony* were equall: the *Manichees* for taking away *Freewill* &c. what would the said Fathers conceaue, (if they had liued in our dayes) & should obserue the Protestants to in-

incorporate and ingrosse in their faythand religion, almost twenty distinct heresies, condemned in those ancient times (as is aboue shewed:) would these Fathers (thinke you) be persuaded, that the Romane Church, and these men could make one and the same Church? From this then it followeth, that eyther *Generall Councels* and particuler *Ancient Fathers* did erre, & commit great ouersight in condéning of strange opinions for heresies which were not heresies; or that the Protestãts & the Catholikes cannot be mébers of one & the same Church; since certayne it is, that the true Church of Christ cannot professe any one Heresy.

Now, that heretikes are not Mébers of Christs Church, & therfore that the doctrines and innouations mantayned by such men, cannot

be taught & beleiued by the Mē-bers of Christs Church) shall appeare from the great dislike, and auersion, which both Christs Apostles, and the ancient Orthodoxall Fathers did euer beare agaynst such men. And first may occurre that diuine sentence: (p) *A man that is an Heretike after the first, or second admonition; auoyde, knowing that he, who is such, is subuerted and sinneth, being condemned by his owne iudgment.* And agayne the same Apostle: (q) *The workes of the flesh be manifest, which are fornication, vncleanes, impurity, dissention,* (r) *Hereses &c. They which do these things, shall not obtayne the Kingdom of God.* To come to the Fathers, S. *Austin* sayth, (s) *He is an Heretike, who beleeueth falsly touching any part of Christian doctrine.* Which Father in another place thus fearefully censu-

(p) ad Titum c. 3.

(q) epist. ad Galat. c. 5.

(r) So it is translated in the English Bible of the yeare 1576.

(s) Aust. in ps. 11. in Matthæum.

censureth of an Heretike; (t) *If a man be an Heretike, certainely no mã doubteth, but for this alone, that he is an Heretike, he shall not possesse the Kingdome of God.*

(t) *Aust. l. 4. contr. Donatist. c. 8.*

Cyprian: Dominus noster &c. (u) *when our Lord Iesus-Christ did testify in the ghospell, that those were his Enemies, who were not with him, he noted not any one Heresy; but he manifestly sheweth, that all Heretikes whosoeuer are his Enemies &c.* I will conclude with *Ambrose* thus saying: (x) *Heretikes seeme to challenge Christ to them: for no man will deny the name of Christ; neuertheles he indeed denyeth Christ, who doth not cõfesse all points of fayth instituted by Christ.* Now from these testimonies I conclude, that both the Catholikes and Protestants cannot make one and the same Church of God; seeing their disagreements

(u) *Cypr. l. 1. ad Mag.*

(x) *Ambrosel c. in Luc. c. 6.*

in

in matters of Religion are so great, & irreconciliable, as that the one part (as houlding meer contrary doctrines in fayth to the other) must needs therefore be taken for Heretikes in the iudgement of the other party; & consequently not taken as the Members of Christ his Church.

My last argument, which heer I vse, shalbe *ad hominem* (as the *Logitian* calls it.) The Protestants (we know) do call, in the foam of their impure language, the Pope *Antichrist*, and Catholikes the *Members of Antichrist*. Now if Protestants and Catholikes be in one and the same Church, then followeth it (if for the tyme we admit the former dreame for true) that *Antichrist* and the Members of *Antichrist* do make the head & the members of Christs Church.

How

How absurd this is, & incompatible with common reason, I referre to any iudicious man to censure; and the rather, considering the Protestants themselues doe thus teach: (y) *In Babylon* (meaning therby the Church of Rome) *there is no holy Order, or Ministery indeed, but a meere Vsurpation.* Thus farre to demonstrate, that for the freeing and clearing of Protestancy from the former scars of being *Inuisible*, *an Irreality*, a *Non-Entity* &c. it cannot be iustly replyed, (if any such reply should be suggested) that seeing the Protestant Church & the Catholike Church are both but one Church; and seeing the Catholike Church cannot be charged with the spots *Inuisibility*, or *being a Non-Entity* &c. that therfore neyther can the Protestant Church be so charged.

(y) Propositions and Principles disputed *in Geneua. p.* 245.

Thus

Thus our Aduerſaries, we ſee, labour to make the ſplendour of the truth of Chriſtian fayth to caſt its beames indifferently vpon Proteſtancy, and the Catholike Roman fayth: notwithſtanding the great diſſentions touching fayth betweene theſe two Religions, which is as difficult to iuſtify, as to mantayne, that the ſunne can at one and the ſame tyme, ſhine vpon vs, and our *Antipodes*.

THE

THE CONCLVSION.

LEarned Protestants, for whose sake this my labour was first attempted; Heer now my pen (as performing, I trust, what it did assume) stayes it selfe: yet before it giueth its last stop, it is to make bold (by turning it selfe towards you) to expatiate a litle in discourse. You haue seene (by perusing of the former Treatise) *Protestancy* to be fully and punctually dissected; and for the *Catastrophe* and closure of all, it is found to be empty of all *Reality*, and but an *Intentional Name, or VVord*. And since it is a *Non-Ens*, it consequently then may be inferred, that *Protestaancy* and its Religion is false; for if Philosophy teacheth vs, that *Ens*, &

Verum conuertuntur, (as you well know) then by force of reason, & law of contrarieties, it followeth, that, *Non Ens, & Falsum conuertuntur*. You are instructed also (as being learned) by Philosophy, that, *Quæ habent vltimam dispositionem ad Introitum, & Non Esse, desinunt per se Esse*. And so (by *Analogy*) we may heere say of *Protestancy*, that *Protestancy* by seuerall reformations, and all by *Negations and Priuations* (as by so many seuerall dispositions) doth in the end euen of it selfe euaporate and vanish away into *Nothing*. Which being so, how then can any Christian dreame, that the soule of man, which enioyeth the noblest kynd of *Being*, should arriue to its supreme felicity, by professing of that, which hath no *Being*? No. For the fayth of a Protestant is (as I may tearme it)

it) but an *Imputatiue fayth* (as the Protestants speake of *Imputatiue Iustice*) seeing it wanteth all true Inherency in the belieuer.

Now then, all this being most true, and vndenyable, why will you (whome God hath enriched with eleuated Wits, and whose Iudgments are able to penetrate and pierce through the greatest difficultyes) with a blynd and vnexamined assent, thus enthrall yourselues to this *Nothingnesse*, so to terme it, of *Protestancy*?

Thinke of the worth and dignity of a soule, which is the *Antitypon* of the *Deity*, for it is written (a) *faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram*, It is, you know, *immortall*; It must then enioy (according as in this world, it belieues, and acts) for all eternity, Heauen or Hell: the thought wherof is able to ap-

(a) Gen. 1.

pale and ſtrike the ſtrongeſt down through feare, & make him with good Tobias, (b) *manducare panem cum luctu & tremore.* What then remaines, but that euery one of you gather himſelfe together, the better to with-ſtand ſuch forces, as may vndermine the hope of his ſaluation? (c) *Porrò vnum eſt neceſſarium.* This is the buſines, why we were ſent into this world; and of this, each of vs muſt render an account, at the day of our death. Let not then neither the predominancy of the tymes, nor the ſtreame and ſway of Authority, nor expectation of temporall preferments (being but glorious and guilded miſeries) nor any humane illaqueations whatſoeuer, winne ground ſo vpon your wills or iudgements, as (till your liues end) to perſeuere in a Religion, which

(b) Tob. 2.

(c) Luc. 10.

which hath but the word *Religion*, plead for it. (d) *Quid proderit homini, si lucretur mundum totum, & detrimentum animæ suæ faciat?* Therefore now then, beginne to espouse your labours to your owne soules saluation. Implant your selues with an immoueable resolution in our *Affirmatiue*, and Catholike Roman fayth and Religion, which is not only warranted for truth by the Protestants themselues, as appeareth from the precedent Chapters: (so deseruedly may heer take place those words, (e) *Our God is not as their Gods are, our Enemies are euen witnesses.*) But also it is that Religion, which (cōtrary to *Protestancy* therein, being torne with intestine disagreemēts) in regard of perfect *Vnion* in doctrine, both among the members thereof, and with reference to the

(d) Matth. 16.

(e) Deut. 32.

Head, is much honoured by Gods holy word; his *Church* in this respect being (f) *One body, one spouse, and one sheepfould*. And therefore not without iust reason did *S. Hierome* (that great light of *Gods* Church) acknowlede his *Vnion*, and submission to our Roman *Catholike Church* in these wordes: (g) *I do vnite my selfe in Communion with the Chayre of Peter, I know the Church to be builded vpon that Rocke: whosoever doth eate the Lambe out of this House, is become prophane*. And with this, *Iudicious men*, I close vp this short *Treatise*, committing you to his holy Protection, who was content to erect this Church, by the shedding of his owne most precious bloud: and battering at your eares with my incessant praiers, that you would cast of and abandone (for your Soules eternal happi-

(f) Rom. 12. Cant. 6.

(g) Hier. in ep. ad Damasum.

happines, this imaginary fayth, which you call *Proteſtãcy*: it being in it ſelfe, (beſides that it is a *compound* made of the *Ingredients* of ſeuerall *negatiue* condemned *hereſies*) but *an empty ſound of a word, an Irreality, a Phantaſme of the brayne, an Annihilation and waſt of all true Fayth, a Platonicall Idæa, an Ens Rations, a Fabrike only of our Imagination, an Intentionality, a bare Notion of the vnderſtanding*, finally, a *Non-Entity*. My penne lights ſhort to delineate it in wordes: for ſince *wordes* are inuented to expreſſe onely *Things*; how can they expreſſe *Proteſtancy*, it being *Nothing*?

FINIS.